51
44
G. 274
Q. 274

WHITE BOOK

ON THE AMERICAN AND BRITISH POLICY OF INTERVENTION IN WEST GERMANY AND THE REVIVAL OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM

1209
UTT
346
S

J. C. KUMARAPPA,
T. KALLUPATTI P. O.
(Via) Tirumangalam S. Ry.
No. 327/1

White Book on the American and British Policy of Intervention in West Germany
and the revival of German Imperialism

G. 274

WHITE BOOK

ON THE AMERICAN AND BRITISH POLICY OF INTERVENTION IN WEST GERMANY AND THE REVIVAL OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM

Presented by the National Council of the National Front of Democratic Germany

Translator's note:

A number of quotations from non-German sources have been re-translated from the German.

German edition completed on August 4th 1951.

CONTENTS

Preface

I. To prepare war, Germany was split

1. From the debit balance of the German imperialists 13
The victims of the First World War 13 / The Losses of the Second World War 13 / German youth decimated 14 / He who begins a war must pay for it 15

2. The agreement which should ensure peace 16
The main aims of Potsdam 16 / "Reactionaries everywhere are dissatisfied" 17 / The basis of German unity 17

3. Two ways in Germany 18
The road to democracy and peace 18 / West Germany—sanctuary for aggressors 20 / West German Monopoly Capital under US protection 21 / Aren't the Ruhr bosses so bad after all? 21 / "The greatest lie of all—Anti-bolshevism" 22

4. An inglorious tradition 23
"Clearing up the Eastern theatre" 23 / Anti-bolshevism brings dollar loans 23 / From Locarno to Munich 24 / "A free hand in the East" 24 / Professor Driault's dream 25 / "Like a knife through butter" 25 / The speculation which went wrong 26

5. The aim of US policy: splitting Germany and making war 27
West Germany as US base and part of a "Western bloc" 28 / Contradiction between words and deeds 29 / Business friends and allies 30 / The game of sabotage 31 / Splitting Germany—a step along the road of US aggression 34 / Adenauer's "conscience" and Schumacher's "disappointment" 38 / "Foreign policy towards the East" 39

II. German imperialism greedy for war—chief alle of American imperialism

1. West German armament potential 43
2. West Germany—most dangerous breeding ground of aggression in Europe 47
3. Exploiting the plight of resettlers 51
4. West Germany's role in relation to the peoples of Europe 53

III. West Germany's economic potential and war economy

1. German and American monopoly capital interlock 57
Germany's indebtedness under GARIOA and the Marshall Plan 57 / Bonn's total indebtedness 58 / American share in West Germany 59

2. German imperialism is reborn 61
The punishment of war criminals prevented 61 / The salvation of German monopoly capital 62 / The "Hessen case" 64 / The "case of North-Rhine Westphalia" 64 / Reorganisation of the West German Trusts 64 / The power of the banks is unbroken 66 / Unrestricted government by financiers 66 / Participation in "opening up" Africa 68

3. The most dangerous warmongering trusts in West Germany 69
Krupp and Thyssen 70 / Klöckner, Mannesmann, Haniel and Hoesch 71 / The house of Stinnes 72

4. West German economy—a part of American war economy 74
Retention of war economy 74 / Growth of the armaments industry—throttling of peace industry 74 / Industries controlled by American capital in the lead 75 / The resurrection of "Wehrwirtschaft" 76 / Compulsory war economy is in course of construction 77 / Bonn's "Commissar for Raw Materials" / Foreign Trade in the service of remilitarisation 79 / Arms' imports 80 / The workers bear the brunt of rearmament 81

IV. The Bonn West Zonal State—made in USA

1. The Bonn West Zonal State was created for American War 87
"National equality"—a preconcerted plot 87 / War is the reason for the existence of the West German separatist state and for its reactionary character 88 / Renazification and remilitarisation go hand in hand 88

2. The Bonn cabinet of militarists in action against peace 89
Ban on the plebiscite on German remilitarisation 89 / Bonn Parliament debates the ban 90 / A negation of democracy—shutting the people's mouths 92 / The prelude to the ban on the plebiscite 92 / Free German Youth banned in West Germany because they fight for peace 93 / The real reason for the ban 94 / The right to refuse military service would make the introduction of conscription difficult 95 / Lehr's police in action against children 96

3. Neo-fascism flourishes in the garden of remilitarisation 96
The "Bund deutscher Jugend" 96 / United States espionage organisations exposed and liquidated 98 / Americans spies and agents 98 / The "First Legion" 99 / Minister appeals to young terrorists 100 / Government money for neo-fascist organisations 100 / Legalised "Werwolves" 100 / The "Brotherhood"—agents of the occupation powers in West Germany 100 / Ex-servicemen's organisations 101 / Armoured corps "Greater Germany" 101 / The parachutists 102

4. **Laws on the nazi pattern** 103
The Bonn convict law of 9/10th July 1951 103 / Hamburg newspaper attacks Bonn convict law 104 / Coburg "Neue Presse" on the convict law 104 / Censorship regulation endangers political liberty 105 / The history of the Gestapo law 105 / Waves of terror against the Communist Party—ban on the council of the VVN 107

V. West Germanys as Recruiting territory, Manoeuvre ground and military base for American war

1. **West Germany's position in American strategic plans** 111
What the warmongers plan for the people in West Germany 111 / Western powers remilitarise West Germany contrary to international agreements 112 / Atlantic war bloc plans of aggression camouflaged as defence 113 / Truman confirms Stalin's reasoning 113 / Truman's cynicism 115 / West Europe's war potential in Eisenhower's plan 116 / Eisenhower's "division of labour" 117 / The Western powers' strategic plans for the European campaign 118 / A German "stooge" has his doubts 119 / The atom bomb strategists of the imperialists 120

2. **Germany—main theatre of war** 121
American war plans for battles in Germany 121 / Plans to turn Upper Rhine Valley into a swamp 123 / Preparations to blow up bridges and tunnels 124 / The zone of death between Rhine and Elbe 126 / Number of airfields in West Germany increased 127 / Manoevre grounds and firing ranges in West Germany for American war 128 / Social Democrat Schumacher adopts Goebbels' suicidal strategy 129

3. **German mercenaries as "suicide squads" for the American war** 132
A glance at history 132 / Not our boys 133 / Eisenhower does not want Hessian mercenaries 134 / Diplomatic fencing on remilitarisation 135 / American invasion to support remilitarisation 137

4. **Creating the "psychological conditions"** 139
Eisenhower rehabilitates German "soldierly honour" 139 / Amnesty for nazi war criminals—preparation for American war 140 / "Ending the state of war"—no peace treaty 143

5. **The German General Staff at work** 144
The general staff—the root and the driving force of revived German militarism 144 / Halder and Guderian—two of Hitler's general staff chiefs in US pay 145 / Theodor Blank and the "Sicherheitsamt" 147 / Count Schwerin—nazi general and international agent 148 / Speidel and Co., Ltd. 149 / Minister Spiecker 149 / The Papal Nuncio in Bonn 151 / The "Brotherhood" once again 151

6. **The German shocktroops—the lost contingent in the American war . . . 153**

The negotiations between Bonn and the Western powers 153 / The organisational stage reached by remilitarisation 156 / Police as cadre organisation for a mass army 158 / "Labour Units"—a camouflaged army 161 / Naval rearmament 162 / Civil Defence and security zones 163

VI. The German poeple fight for National Unity and against war

1. **Unity for a democratic, peace-loving Germany—the condition for peace . 167**

Decision on the existence of the German nation 167 / The National Front of Democratic Germany 168 / The formation of the German Democratic Republic 169 / Grotewohl's letter and the Volkskammer offer 170

2. **Unity of government and people 171**

The attitude towards peace: a criterion for every German 171 / Appeal for national resistance 172

3. **Resistance in West Germany 172**

Workers and generals 172 / "After all I have four children" 173 / "A revival of German militarism is the death sentence for democracy 174 / The development from "Ohne uns" to resistance 174 / The fight of the West German workers 175 / Peasants defend their fields 176 / "The Christian task of the day" 178 / For neutrality—against remilitarisation 179 / Youth in the forefront 179 / Youth act against demolitions 180 / Courts oppose Adenauer 181 / Clear answer to the policy of war 181

4. **Plebiscite throughout Germany 182**

Illegal ban on plebiscite in West Germany 182 / Twenty different plebiscite polls—one result 183 / Private polls show overwhelming majority against remilitarisation 184 / Remilitarisation is rejected in Munich just as in Berlin 185 / Plebiscite in the German Democratic Republic 187

5. **A severe blow 189**

6 **The German people are not alone 191**

Peace can be maintained 193

Preface

The National Council of the National Front of Democratic Germany presents this collection of documents to the German people and all peace-loving peoples because the government of the USA, Britain and France intend to order openly the reestablishment of the German Wehrmacht in autumn this year. The West German separatist government has already begun to make all organisational, political and economic preparations for the formation of the German Wehrmacht.

The facts given in this White Book prove that what have been set up in Germany are not simply police formations but that reviving German imperialism is creating the new offensive army with which it wants to conquer supremacy in Europe under the leadership of the USA. German imperialism, using the excuse of "Uniting Europe", is trying to establish its leadership over the European Marshall Plan countries and to prepare the attack on the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic.

The White Book proves that it is the Western occupation powers and their troops of intervention in West Germany who are helping the renewal of German imperialism. This is taking place despite the Potsdam Agreement and against the will of the majority of the German population who do not wish to sacrifice their homeland and themselves for the aggressive aims of American and German monopoly capital.

The National Council requests all peace-loving people, particularly all members of parliaments and the officials of democratic associations and organisations, to remember their great responsibility and to cooperate in helping to make the peoples aware of the great danger threatening them from the renewal of German imperialism under the leadership of American industrial and banking bosses.

Berlin, August 1951

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL FRONT OF DEMOCRATIC GERMANY

I.

TO PREPARE WAR, GERMANY WAS SPLIT

1. From the debit balance of the German imperialists 13

The victims of the First World War 13 / The Losses of the Second World War 13 / German youth decimated 14 / He who begins a war must pay for it 15

2. The agreement which should ensure peace 16

The main aims of Potsdam 16 / "Reactionaries everywhere are dissatisfied" 17 / The basis of German unity 17

3. Two ways in Germany 18

The road to democracy and peace 18 / West Germany—sanctuary for aggressors 20 / West German Monopoly Capital under US protection 21 / Aren't the Ruhr bosses so bad after all? 21 / "The greatest lie of all—Anti-bolshevism" 22

4. An inglorious tradition 23

"Clearing up the Eastern theatre" 23 / Anti-bolshevism brings dollar loans 23 / From Locarno to Munich 24 / "A free hand in the East" 24 / Professor Driault's dream 25 / "Like a knife through butter" 25 / The speculation which went wrong 26

5. The aim of US policy: splitting Germany and making war 27

West Germany as US base and part of a "Western bloc" 28 / Contradiction between words and deeds 29 / Business friends and allies 30 / The game of sabotage 31 / Splitting Germany—a step along the road of US aggression 34 / Adenauer's "conscience" and Schumacher's "disappointment" 38 / "Foreign policy towards the East" 39

1. From the debit balance of the German imperialists

The American imperialists who are feverishly preparing an aggressive war against the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic, together with their German protegés and allies the German imperialists, are making every effort to see that the peoples forget the horrors of war and the debit balance of German imperialism. It would therefore appear useful to recall a number of facts:

The victims of the First World War

During the First World war from 1914—1918 for which predatory German imperialism was one of those mainly responsible, 8,732,000 people, the flower of European youth, were killed. 20,816,000 were wounded. In dead alone Germany lost 1,808,000, Austria-Hungary 1,000,000, France 1,354,000, Russia 2,250.000, Great Britain 869,000 and Belgium 115,000. The United States, which only took part in the last phase of the war, lost 126,000 dead.

The immediate cost of the war to all states taking part was estimated by an American source at 337.9 thousand million dollars, and the extent of war damage at 36.9 thousand million dollars.

The Losses of the Second World War

The extent of the suffering and loss which German imperialism brought mankind through the Second World War is clearly seen from the fact that until the present day there is no generally accepted total figure of those killed. It is, however, possible to get a nearly complete picture from the official and semi-official announcements made by most states concerned.

The Soviet Union alone, which was brazenly attacked by Hitler, and in whose territory the German occupation troops carried out a policy of extermination, lost 7 million dead. The war costs and the losses through destruction, etc. of the Soviet Union alone, which carried the main brunt of the fight against bestial German imperialism, amounted to 485 thousand million dollars. They thus exceed very considerably the entire cost and losses of all countries participating in the First World War. (See V. M. Molotov "Questions of Foreign Policy", Moscow 1949, p. 394/395 German edition.)

Poland had the next heaviest casualty list to the Soviet Union with 6 million dead, and at the same time the most serious destruction of its cities and villages. The city of Warsaw alone, with 780,000 dead, lost more people than the entire British Empire.

According to official figures France lost 576,000 persons. 198.000 of them fell on the battle field or died in German prisoner-of-war camps. 37,000 fell as fighters of the underground movement, nearly 10,000 were shot as members of the resistance by the German occupation forces and over 59,000 were killed in air-attacks (mainly American attacks on French towns). The others were murdered

in German concentration camps and at other places to which they had been deported. Holland lost some 200,000 persons, the British Empire about 700,000. The United States lost a total of 314 000 dead in all theatres of war, lower than the casualties every year in the United States through traffic accidents.

The total number of those killed in the Second World War, all of them victims of German imperialism, can be estimated at about 27 million. An estimate issued by the Vatican gives the undoubtedly too low figure of 22,060,000 deaths. (World Almanac, New York 1947, Scripps-Howard Press, p. 521.)

More than 8 million people, men, women, children and old people were murdered in the German concentration camps alone. Further millions of peaceful citizens of all European countries were killed in the course of the extermination policy of the German imperialists in Poland, the Soviet Union and in all occupied countries, and in the persecution of the Jews and in punitive expeditions. "Germany became a great torture chamber. The cries of the victims could be heard in the entire world." (From the prosecution speech of the American Chief Prosecutor, Robert H. Jackson, to the Nuremberg tribunal.)

The total cost and material losses of all countries, with the exception of China, during the Second World War amounted to 1350 thousand million dollars, according to an American estimate. (World Almanac, New York 1950, Scripps-Howard Press, p. 746.)

This is only an extract from the terrible debit balance of the German imperialists. To rearm them and let them loose on humanity would be a crime. The imperialists of the United States, and the governments and ruling circles of the European countries who support their policy of war, are making themselves guilty of this crime.

German youth decimated

The German people suffered extraordinarily heavy losses. They paid heavily for the fact that they allowed themselves to be misused by German imperialism for a war of robbery and extermination against the peace-loving peoples without a parallel in history.

According to figures so far available, the German people lost about five and a half million dead. From this total about 3,300,000 fell at the front, 500,000 were identified victims of air raids, about 200,000 Jews were murdered by the Nazis. The other one and a half million reported missing at the front, in air raids, during retreats and evacuations must be mostly regarded as dead. For supporters of resurgent German militarism it is perhaps not unimportant to note that between 75 % and 85 % of the total losses of the German army occurred in connection with the invasion of the Soviet Union and on the Eastern front. (These figures are mainly based on a work published in "Wirtschaft und Statistik", November 1949, No. 8, and on figures of losses in the Second World War collected in Blackett's "Military and political consequences of atomic energy", German edition, Berlin 1949, Appendix II, p. 263 et. seq.)

A characteristic report published by the "Schwäbische Tagblatt", Tübingen, on February 3rd 1951, shows the great gaps torn in the young generation of Germany by the criminal robber war of German imperialism. This report states that according to statistics of the "Deutschen Reichsbundes der Kriegs- und Zivilbeschädigten", of 100 Germans born in 1924 25 were dead or missing, 31 were seriously injured, 5 had received slight wounds and 2 became permanent invalids. Only 37 of the 100 were alive and healthy. That is the picture of those born in one year. The picture for other age-groups of the young German generation is similar.

He who begins a war must pay for it

The United States Chief Prosecutor, Robert H. Jackson, in his prosecution speech to the Nuremberg tribunal, admitted that the United States had suffered the least damage:

> "Our American towns have not been exposed, day and night, to a rain of bombs. Our temples have not been laid in ruins and our countrymen have not had their houses destroyed."

Jackson made a solemn declaration that despite this the United States was second to none in the determination to make a repetition of German aggression impossible, and continued:

> "Twice in my lifetime the United States has sent its young men across the Atlantic Ocean, has nearly exhausted its resources and loaded itself with debts in order to help to subdue Germany... The United States cannot throw generation after generation of its youth upon the battlefields of Europe... Experience has taught that wars can no longer be contained; all modern wars finally become world wars, and none of the great powers at least can remain outside. If we cannot remain outside a war then we have only one hope — to avoid it..." It was necessary "to create a legal security that he who begins a war must pay for it."

The policy of the United States since the end of the Second World War and since the days of the Nuremberg Tribunal has been in contradiction to these statements made by Robert H. Jackson. For the third time the United States is sending "its young men across the Atlantic Ocean" but this time not in order to halt the aggression of German imperialism, or to help liberate peoples enslaved or threatened by an aggressor, but in order to attack peace-loving peoples themselves; in order to arm German imperialism again and together with German imperialism to plunge the world into a new war.

If the American warmongers and their allies and helpers in West Germany were capable of learning from recent history they would discover by studying the story of the Nuremberg tribunal that, if they start their war, the day will inevitably come when they will sit in the dock like the war criminals of Nuremberg. They would not then be able to proclaim that they had not realised what the consequences of their actions would be.

2. The agreement which should ensure peace

The main aims of Potsdam

The foundation of the post-war policy of the great powers was to be cooperation and mutual understanding. This was laid down in the Declaration of Yalta, also known as the Crimea Declaration, signed by Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, which resulted from the Crimean Conference, February 3rd to 11th 1945. It stated:

> "Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our governments owe to our peoples and to all the peoples of the world."

In order to ensure peace for a long period and to make every aggression by German imperialism impossible in future, the "big three" agreed at Yalta:

> "It is our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and nazism and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world... It is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany, but only when nazism and militarism have been extirpated, will there be hope for a decent life for Germans, and a place for them in the comity of nations."

The Agreement made at Yalta forms the basis for the Potsdam Agreement which states in Part III dealing with Germany:

> "The purpose of this Agreement is to carry out the Crimean Declaration on Germany. German militarism and nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take, in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbours or the peoples of the world.
>
> It is not the intention of the Allies to destroy or enslave the German people. It is the intention of the Allies that the German people be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis."

In this connection the most important measures for ensuring peace laid down in the Potsdam Agreement are of special importance: The complete disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany, the arrest and bringing to judgement of those responsible for the war and for Nazi crimes, the final reform of German political life on a democratic basis, the decentralisation of German economic life "for the purpose of eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular by cartels, syndicates, trusts, and other monopolistic arrangements". For the German people the principle laid down in the Potsdam Declaration, that Germany should be treated as a single unit, is of decisive importance. This principle is underlined by the obligation to set up a number of important central administrative organs for the whole of Germany until the formation of an all-German government.

"Reactionaries everywhere dissatisfied"

The Potsdam Agreement, which was signed by Stalin, Truman and Attlee, was regarded in the United States too as a blow to the American pro-war party, and the American and British monopolists, who "bowed to fascism before the war and hoped for the renewal of the German big monopolies after the war". The New York newspaper "P. M." stated on August 5th 1945, three days after the signing of the Potsdam Declaration:

> "The decisions on Germany mean a complete defeat of those financial and industrial circles in the United States and Britain who bowed down to fascism before the war and hoped for the renewal of the German big monopolies after the war, who supported Hitler... the removal of German monopoly control over ... German industry is an outstanding achievement of this historic conference ... The decisions of the Potsdam conference have one aim: to secure peace. Reactionaries everywhere will be dissatisfied with this."

The one-time sponsors of Hitler and the present sponsors of German imperialism did not admit defeat so easily, as one may see today. They consistently followed a policy of splitting Germany in order to avoid carrying out the Potsdam Agreement, at least in West Germany which they occupied.

The basis of Germany unity

Even at the Teheran Conference on December 1st 1943, and later at negotiations in Moscow, the Western powers tried to insist on the partitioning of Germany.

In Teheran the United States made the proposal to split Germany into five parts. About a year later in October 1944 the plan of the British government to split Germany into three parts was discussed. These disclosures of the attempts made by the Western powers to partition Germany were contained in a declaration made on April 11th 1947 by V. M. Molotov at the Moscow Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers.

In this connection Molotov recalled the well-known declaration made by J. V. Stalin on May 9th 1945, which stated in part:

> "Three years ago Hitler announced to the whole world that his purpose was to partition the Soviet Union, to amputate the Caucasus, the Ukraine, Bielo-Russia, the Baltic countries and other Soviet territory... Germany is defeated. The German troops capitulate. The Soviet Union celebrates victory but she does not intend to partition or destroy Germany."

The Soviet Union thus clearly rejected all attempts of the Western powers to split Germany into three or even into five parts. The Soviet point of view that Germany's economic and political unity must be maintained was embodied in the Potsdam Agreement.

It is not only in the interests of the peoples who conquered German imperialism in the Second World War that the Potsdam Agreement should be carried out, it is also in the interests of the German people. The Potsdam Agreement, which

pledges the creation and development of a peace-loving, democratic Germany, is the only international agreement recognised by all victorious powers which gives the German people a legal claim to unity and to the prevention and removal of all partitioning and mutilation. This legal claim remains one of the most important weapons of the German people in their fight for unity and the preservation of peace.

The imperialist Western powers who have broken the Potsdam Agreement and break it anew every day, have thereby destroyed the legal basis for the occupation of West Germany, for their own presence in West Germany. By destroying the legal basis for their stay in West Germany the troops of the imperialist Western powers have ceased to be occupation troops and have become intervention troops contrary to international law.

3. Two ways in Germany

The road to democracy and peace

In contrast to West Germany where the American, British and French occupation authorities have consistently sabotaged the carrying out of those clauses of the Potsdam Agreement concerning Germany, the measures agreed in Potsdam have been carried out in the German Democratic Republic in the spirit and in the letter.

The Soviet Union is the only power among the signatories who in 1945, without hesitation, began to carry out the agreement honestly and without reservation. In her occupation zone she carried out complete demilitarisation and disarmament, she made sure of the arrest and punishment of those responsible for the war and nazi crimes, she supported and helped all German democratic forces, aided the formation of democratic parties and all efforts which were being made to reform political life on a democratic basis; she helped above all the development of German peace economy.

The German democratic forces in what was then the Soviet zone of occupation aimed from the very first at cutting the ground from under the feet of aggressive, predatory German imperialism and militarism in the interests of both the German people and of all peace-loving peoples. The appeal of the Communist Party of Germany issued at the beginning of June 1945 and published in "Deutsche Volkszeitung", central organ of the Communist Party of Germany, No. 1, on June 13th 1945, made the following demands, among others:

> "(6) Confiscation of the entire property of nazi bosses and war criminals, transfer of this property to the custodianship of the people...
>
> (7) Liquidation of big landed property, the huge estates of the junkers, counts and dukes and the transfer of their entire land, livestock and equipment to the provincial administration for distribution to those peasants who have been ruined by the war and lost their property. It is to be understood that these measures will affect in no way the property and economy of rich peasants."

In accordance with these clearly expressed aims and the clauses of the Potsdam Agreement the land reform was carried out in autumn 1945 in the territory which today forms the German Democratic Republic. This removed the basis of the reactionary junkers, one of the props of aggressive German imperialism.

> "Democratic land reform is a national economic and social necessity. It cannot be postponed. It must guarantee the liquidation of feudal junker estate ownership and end the hegemony of junkers and estate owners in the village, since this hegemony has always been a bastion of reaction and fascism in our country and one of the main sources of aggression and wars of conquest against other peoples. The land reform will turn into reality the centuries-old dream of those peasants and landworkers who had little or no land, by dividing up the great estates. The land reform is thus the most important basis for the democratic reform and economic recovery of our country.
>
> Land ownership in our German homeland must be based on strong, healthy and productive peasant holdings which are the private property of their owners . . ." (From the "Regulations on Land Reform in the Province Mark Brandenburg", September 6th 1945.)

Similar regulations were passed in all provinces of the then Soviet occupation zone.

In addition the cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements were eliminated in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement. In 1946 the factories of war criminals and nazi criminales and war profiteers were expropriated following a plebiscite and passed into the hands of the people.

> "The entire property of the nazi party and its subsections, the factories and enterprises of war criminals, leaders and active members of the nazi party and the nazi state, and the factories and enterprises which were actively used for war crimes and which were handed over to the Provincial Administration of Saxony, are declared expropriated and to have become the property of the people." (From the "Law on the transfer of the factories of war and nazi criminals to the property of the people"), issued by the Provincial Administration of Saxony, following the plebiscite of June 30th, 1946.

Similar laws were passed and carried out in all provinces of the then Soviet occupation zone. These measures were supplemented by a purge of nazi and militaristic elements from the administration, called for by the Potsdam Agreement and Control Council Directive No. 24.

All these measures together created the basis for a democratic and peaceful development of Germany.

The Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic, Otto Grotewohl, promised in his government declaration in connection with the formation of the German Democratic Republic, that the government would carry out its work in complete adherence to the decisions of the Potsdam Conference.

Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl stated:

"German imperialism has brought the German people two world wars in one generation. That cannot be allowed to happen again. All progressive forces must unitedly see to it that German imperialism, in its drive to conquest, shall never again destroy the basis for the life of the German people.

The government accepts the commission of the Volkskammer (Lower House of Parliament) in this spirit. It will carry out this commission in complete adherence to the decisions of the Potsdam Conference and the other joint declarations of the Allies...

The new road is the road of democracy, peace and friendship with all peoples. In taking this road the government can and will base itself on the decisions of the Potsdam Conference."

West Germany — sanctuary for aggressors

In West Germany demilitarisation, which was never completely carried out, has become open remilitarisation and the disarmament of German imperialism has become the open rearmament of German imperialism. Those responsible for the war and for nazi crimes were imprisoned and punished only in the first period after the war and only to a small extent and that solely under the pressure of the peoples who demanded retribution for the crimes committed by German imperialism. Many leading criminals and those who had pulled the strings from behind the scenes were only interned for a short time and then released and reinstated in the possession of their former property and position. Others were not touched at all. It could be seen later that some of the war criminals and controllers of the nazi regime, like Krupp and his consorts, were imprisoned in order to protect them from the just indignation of the peoples, including the German people, and not in order to punish them for the crimes they had committed.

"Denazification" in West Germany was a simple mockery of the Potsdam Agreement. In the then Soviet occupation zone those officials and members of the nazi party and its suborganisations against whom crimes could be proved were brought before the courts and punished. In the Western occupation zones, on the other hand, all the ordinary members of the nazi party and its suborganisations were dragged in front of denazification courts, which were naturally not in a position to carry out millions of cases even half way satisfactorily. Denazification was thus purposely made into a ridiculous matter of form. The worst nazi and war criminals provided each other with so-called "Persil-letters" (Persil is a well known soap powder: the German war criminals in West Germany whitewashed each other with these letters) proving their innocence and that they had only been nominal members of the nazi party, the SS or the SA (storm troops). That was exactly what was intended by this method of procedure. Countless criminals were able to hide amongst the millions of small, nominal members of the nazi party. Corruption flourished.

West German Monopoly Capital under US protection

The picture with regard to the destruction of the cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements, agreed to a Potsdam, was similar in West Germany to the picture of denazification. Junker estates were left untouched. The forces of German imperialism, the Krupps, the Thyssens and other who waged the First World War to redistribute the world, who brought Hitler to power and started the Second World War, are in control again in West Germany today. It is they who control the Adenauer government. They profit by the remilitarisation of West Germany and they expect to earn enormous sums in a future war.

Despite all the intrigues of the Western occupation authorities and their obedient German servants, the German population in some cases, as in Hessen and North-Rhine Westphalia, loudly demanded the removal of economic power from the reactionary heavy industrialists and bankers. When the German population refused to abandon this claim, the Western occupation powers intervened directly to protect their German friends, the German imperialists, monopolists, bankers and junkers. One can say in fact, that West Germany was declared by the United States a sanctuary for German war criminals and imperialists.

Aren't the Ruhr bosses so bad after all?

The Western powers generally use two arguments to justify the breach of the Potsdam Agreement and the conservation and reestablishment of German imperialism in West Germany.

First of all they claim that the German industrial bosses are "not really so bad" and that, after all, they had had very little in common with the nazi party and the crimes of the nazi regime. In addition they claim they need the German imperialists and their entire apparatus for the "fight against bolshevism".

The investigating Committee established by the United States Senate in 1945 under the chairmanship of Senator Kilgore gave the following answer to the first argument:

> "(1) It is not true that the big industrialists of Germany joined the National Socialist Movement at the last moment and partly under pressure. They were, from the very first, enthusiastic patrons of the movement.
> (2) Support from German heavy industry and high finance made it possible for the National Socialists to seize power.
> (3) The change-over of German economy to war economy and the feverish preparations for aggressive war took place under the immediate leadership of the German industrialists."
>
> In a supplementary statement Senator Kilgore said:
>
> "The facts show that these industrialists undoubtedly shared the guilt in the crimes committed by the National Socialists against the peoples of the earth in their greed for world power." (Quoted from: "Allgemeine Zeitung", organ of the US occupation forces, Berlin, October 12th 1945)

"The greatest lie of all — Anti-bolshevism"

Senator Thomas, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the American Senate, gave a clear answer to the second argument in an article published in September 1945, in the magazine "Reader's Scope", under the title: "Anti-bolshevism — the greatest lie of all." In this article he stated:

> "Americans must remember the frightful slogan under which Dachau flourished, the slogan expressing the greatest lie of all time, namely, that it was all being done to save the world from Bolshevism. Americans who have been shocked by the concentration camps must note that the German industrial and financial bosses provided money to create this regime of terror based on the antibolshevist lie... Ordinary common sense raises the question why it was necessary to use such means as murder, destruction, torture and hunger, infanticide, extermination of innocent Jews, German, Czech and Polish teachers and professors in order to save the world from Bolshevism. The answer is quite simple: the Hitler fascists had to suppress the anti-hitler opposition to stop decent people from learning the truth, since these would otherwise have got together to destroy hitlerism and the anti-bolshevist lie which it created. The deluded nazis who saw themselves as conquerors of the world thought that dead men would tell no tales, but they were mistaken.
>
> The anti-Russian elements in the whole world are still strong... the anti-Russian elements shrink from nothing to carry out their plans to hinder agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.
>
> War in Europe ended only three months ago... but some American papers are already noisily discussing the question of a 'War with Russia'. They will go on doing this if we do not get rid of them and those behind them with the same determination with which we ended the crimes of the nazi murderers. In order to make hopes of a lasting peace come true and to see justice done to the victims of the nazi terror we need firm cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union."

The American imperialists try to tell the world today that they had to break the Potsdam Agreement and rearm aggressive German imperialism because this was necessary for their "fight against the bolshevist menace". In the same way the American imperialists want to convince the world that they have to burn and destroy the towns and villages, the temples and the factories of Korea, that they have to murder, burn and loot, slaughter women, children and old people because this is called for by their "fight against the Bolshevist menace". And if the peace-loving peoples of all nations do not prevent them they will repeat these crimes to-morrow in Germany, in France or in Italy, with the lying excuse, the same excuse which Hitler always used, that this is necessary in the "fight against Bolshevism". The imperialists are making a mistake, however, for the peoples will accept no excuse for the resuscitation and re-armament of German imperialism.

4. An inglorious tradition

"Clearing up the Eastern theatre"

The policy of helping and using the most aggressive and the most reactionary forces in Germany both against the Soviet Union and against German democrats was not invented in the years following 1945. This tradition has an inglorious history many decades long, starting during the First World War. Thanks partly to this policy all efforts to prevent the Second World War failed. This policy of the Western powers and the German imperialists is today once again a serious threat to peace and the existence of the German nation.

In his memoirs of the First World War, Winston Churchill described how, at a time when the German troops still occupied large parts of the Ukraine, White Russia, and the Baltic countries, he himself proposed that the Western powers should make use of German military power in the war of intervention against the young Soviet state. He proposed cooperation with the same German military power which had just fought a bitter four-year war in which 869,000 citizens of Great Britain and more than 1.3 million Frenchmen had lost their lives. Churchill, in his memoirs, stated in the chapter "The great war":

> "To lay hands on Russia is a task too great for the victorious powers alone. If we want to do this we can do it only with the help of Germany. At the moment they (the Germans, ed.) hold in occupation the richest and most densely populated areas of Russia. Should not they, just like us, take a hand in clearing up the great Eastern theatre of operations?"

Churchill was not the only person of this opinion. The idea of inciting the German militarists to attack the young Soviet state was expressed quite openly by responsible American military authorities. The Commander-in-Chief of the American Occupation Army in Germany after the First World War, General Henry T. Allen, stated in his diary that Germany must be given "permission" to expand to the East. He gave his reasons as follows:

> "An expansion of Germany into Russian territory would have kept the Germans occupied for a long time and thereby reduced the tension vis à vis West Europe." (Henry T. Allen, "My Rhineland Diary", Berlin 1932, p. 51.)

Anti-bolshevism brings dollar loans

In the years between the two world wars one of the main concerns of the Western powers was to prevent a good and lasting cooperation between Germany and the Soviet Union and to support with all their power the "Drang nach Osten" (Drive to the East) of the German imperialists.

The German reactionaries soon realised how to exploit this situation for their own ends by offering themselves to the Western powers as allies against the Soviet Union thus winning considerable advantages for themselves.

Another means which was almost always successful in winning concessions for German imperialism from the reactionary governments of the Western powers, who were blinded by their anti-bolshevism, was the often repeated

allegation of a "Bolshevist danger" in Germany itself and the alleged necessity of providing military forces to suppress it. This method was also used by the German imperialists after 1945 in West Germany.

From Locarno to Munich

With the Locarno policy the Western powers intended to include Germany as a definite part of their "cordon sanitaire" against the Soviet Union and, at the same time, to direct the aim of aggressive German imperialism towards the East, against the Soviet Union. In the Locarno pact the Western powers were ready to guarantee various frontiers in West Europe but they bitterly opposed all guarantees for the frontiers in Eastern Europe and thus gave the German imperialists to understand that they had free scope for expansion there.

The disgraceful policy of the Western powers of encouraging German imperialism to attack the East, reached its climax in 1938 in the treacherous Munich Agreement in which Great Britain and France sold their Czechoslovak ally to Hitler, the exponent of the policy of German imperialism. At the same time they intended to place the Soviet Union in a position of hopeless isolation. This policy of treaty-breaking led directly to the Second World War. The French government, by aiding and abetting the most reactionary and aggressive forces of German imperialism, laid the foundations for the French defeat in 1940.

"A free hand in the East"

After Hitler, by marching into Prague, had proved that he had no intention of fulfilling the agreements which he had just made with France and Great Britain, the governments of these countries, supported by the United States, continued their old policy and made further efforts to encourage German imperialism to attack the Soviet Union. While the governments of Great Britain and France pretended, under pressure of public opinion in their countries, to negotiate seriously with the Soviet Union for a treaty against the threat of German imperialism, they actually sabotaged these negotiations and made sure that they produced no results. On the other hand, the British government had secret negotiations with Hitler only a few weeks before the war began at which they attempted to reach an agreement on the division of the world into spheres of interest. Hitler was again promised "a free hand in the East". The history and the background of this double-crossing by the Western powers are contained in the well-known collection of documents published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR "Documents and Materials relating to the Eve of the Second World War", and in the declaration issued by the Information Bureau of the Soviet Union in this connection, entitled "The falsifiers of history — a historical correction". The documents on the secret negotiations carried on, as late as July and August 1939, by the British government with Hitler show clearly the effort of the British government to direct German aggression to the East, against Poland and against the Soviet Union.

In their blindness the British, French and also the American patrons of Hitler did not realise that the German imperialists, after their attack on Poland, intended to turn their main attack next on France and England. They carried

out this plan, as is well-known, despite or even because of the friendly help and patronage which they had received from the British and French governments and from the ruling circles of the USA. The peoples had to pay with blood and tears for the policies of their governments.

Professor Driault's dream

The French people had to pay particularily dearly for the policy of their government. On December 23rd 1938 the "Temps", official organ of the French Foreign Ministry, described this policy quite clearly by writing: "Luckily, Herr Hitler is thinking about the Ukraine". The point of view of the ruling class of France was expressed even more clearly by the French historian, Professor Edouard Driault, a friend of Daladier's, who writing on June 1st 1940 in the magazine "Révue des études napoléoniennes" stated:

> "My political dream for the year 1940 A. D. is that Daladier and Chamberlain should give Hitler Russia up to Vladivostock and then everybody would be happy." (quoted from: "History of Diplomacy", vol. 3, German edition, Moscow 1947, p. 826.)

Ten days after this article appeared the troops of imperialist Germany marched into Paris.

The point of view expressed by Professor Driault, who would like to have thrown the whole Soviet Union into Hitler's maw if he had only been able to, was reflected clearly in the actions of the French and British governments during the period described as "ce drôle de guerre" or the "phoney war". In this phoney war (the situation on the German-French frontier from Hitler's attack on Poland until his invasion of France) the Western powers waited inactively for months to see what Hitler intended to do, after invaded Poland had waited in vain for the promised help from Great Britain and France.

"Like a knife through butter"

Hitler's "Blitzkrieg" in France showed that practically nothing serious had been done to reorganise, train or arm the French army for the coming battles or to bring up reserves. On the other hand the British and French governments concerned themselves at this time with the plan to send an expeditionary force to attack the Soviet Union from Finland and Turkey. Instead of the war against German imperialism they wanted a war against the Soviet Union, and for this purpose they provided great quantities of war material which were sadly lacking a short time later in the battles against Hitler in France.

A White Book published by the Swedish Foreign Ministry in 1947 confirmed these facts in a document originating from the Swedish Foreign Minister Guenther:

> "... The despatch of these contingents of troops was part of the over-all plan for an attack on the Soviet Union and this plan 'will go into operation on March 15th against Baku and still earlier against Finland'." (White Book of the Swedish Foreign Ministry, Stockholm, 1947. Quoted from "The falsifiers of history — a historical correction", German edition, Information Bureau of the Soviet Union, 1949, Part. IV.)

This plan of the Western powers, which meant a direct support for German imperialism in its war against themselves, was worked out in France by de Gaulle and General Weygand who was at that time in command of the French troops in Syria. Weygand boasted that he would "with a few reinforcements and 200 planes occupy the Caucasus and push into Russia like 'a knife through butter'." (Quoted from: "The falsifiers of history — a historical correction.")

Only a little while later Hitler's invading divisions were able to cut through France "like a knife through butter" thanks to the suicidal policy of their imperialist opponents in France. The policy of supporting German imperialism ended quite logically in a catastrophe for France and brought Great Britain to the brink of disaster.

The speculation which went wrong

Even after Hitler and his Japanese imperialist ally had given the Western powers no other choice but to fight for their lives, even after the Soviet Union and the Western powers had become allies in the fight for the liberation of the peoples against German fascism, the tendency towards a two-way policy remained strong among the Western powers. Representatives of the ruling circles of the Western powers speculated on a great weakening of the Soviet Union, and her exclusion from a decisive role.

This view was put most openly and most bluntly by the then Senator and present President of the United States, Truman who, as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, declared in June 1941: "If we see that Germany is winning we should help Russia and if Russia is winning we should help Germany, so that in this way they kill off as many of each other as possible." ("New York Times", June 23rd 1941.) It was, therefore, Truman's great worry that the butchery could end too soon.

The statement "The falsifiers of history — a historical correction" issued by the Information Bureau of the Soviet Union in 1948, depicted the two-way character of Anglo-American policy during the joint war of liberation against predatory German imperialism as follows:

> "Everyone knows that the Britons and Americans undertook the obligation to open the Second Front in Europe in 1942, expressing this obligation in the British-Soviet communique and the Soviet-American communique of June 1942. This was a solemn promise which can be described as a pledge which had to be carried out promptly in order to relieve the troops of the Soviet Union who, in the first period of the war, had had to carry the entire brunt of resisting German fascism. It is also well-known that this promise was honoured neither in 1942, nor in 1943, although the Soviet government repeatedly declared that the Soviet Union could not agree to a postponement of the Second Front.
>
> The policy of postponing the Second Front was certainly not a coincidence. It was supported by the efforts of the reactionary circles of Britain and the United States who were following aims of their own in the war against Germany which could not be reconciled with the tasks of liberation of the fight against German fascism. The complete destruc-

tion of German fascism was not part of their plan. They were interested in undermining Germany's power and above all in excluding Germany, as a dangerous competitor, from the world market. In this they were guided by their own narrow and selfish aims. It was absolutely not their aim to liberate Germany and other countries from the hegemony of the reactionary forces who were the permanent supporters of imperialist aggression and fascism. Neither were they interested in a thorough democratic reform. (Our italics, ed.)

At the same time they speculated on a weakening of the USSR, they hoped that the USSR would be bled white, that through the exhausting war she would lose, for a long period, her importance as a great and strong power and would become dependent after the war on the USA and Great Britain. It is clear that the Soviet Union cannot regard such an attitude towards an ally as normal."

The speculation of the Western powers that the Soviet Union would be weakened went wrong. The Soviet Union came out of the Second World War stronger than ever. The disappointment and the rage of those who had hoped to benefit was naturally very great. The imperialist forces of the United States and her satellites began, immediately after the defeat of Hitler Germany, with their preparations for an attack on the Soviet Union in which they intended to base themselves on the forces of German militarism and imperialism.

5. The aim of US policy: splitting Germany and making war

The meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and France and the so-called Council of the North Atlantic Pact in New York in September 1950 was one of the main stages in the policy of the imperialist Western powers. This policy aims at splitting Germany, reviving German imperialism and militarism in West Germany and preparing a war of aggression against the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic.

At this New York meeting the following decisions about Germany, which represent serious breaches of the Potsdam Agreement, were taken:
(1) West Germany and West Berlin will be included in the aggressive Atlantic War pact.

(2) The remilitarisation of Western Germany will be speeded up. A West German Army of mercenaries will be established, partly camouflaged as motorised police troops.

(3) A peace treaty will be refused but the "state of war" will be formally brought to an end with simultaneous retention and continuation of the occupation regime.

(4) The occupation and intervention troops of the Western powers in West Germany will be considerably reinforced. Occupation costs will be raised in proportion.

(5) The Bonn government must recognise the German pre-war debts and the obligations arising from Marshall plan shipments. ("Europa Archiv", Frankfurt/Main, Nos. 19 and 20, p. 3405 et seq., p. 3475/76; "Dokumentation der Zeit", Berlin, 10/50, p. 390.)

These decision represent a further great deepening of the split in Germany, a further great step along the road to the resuscitation of German imperialism and militarism, a further sharpening of the danger of war.

Speaking on the radio about this New York Conference and its decisions the American High Commissioner, John McCloy, stated on October 8th, 1950:

> "These decisions represent the latest step in the march towards a goal for which we have been working ever since 1945." ("Europa Archiv", Frankfurt/Main, No. 21/1950, p. 3477.)

McCloy thus admitted that the occupation policy of the United States had aimed since 1945 at splitting Germany, breaking the Potsdam Agreement, conserving and reestablishing German militarism and imperialism, and preparing a new war. This remarkable confession by the United States High Commissioner has been fully confirmed by events since 1945.

West Germany as US base and part of a "Western bloc"

The Potsdam Agreement had scarcely been signed when the aggressive imperialist forces in the United States, Great Britain and France opened a lively campaign to disrupt the understanding and friendly cooperation between the great powers and to prepare a new war against the Soviet Union, using West Germany as a base for US imperialism and as ally in a Western bloc.

As early as 1945 the French reactionaries went even further and produced the idea of a military alliance with a "reorganised" West Germany against the East. The semi-official French press agency "Agence France Presse" stated in its information bulletin in December 1945 that the problem to be solved was the preparation of a war "against an enemy from the East... It would, therefore, be good to establish a Western Allied Military Commission composed of the Allied Chiefs of Staff. After Germany has been reorganised she can also be included in the system."

The attempts to split Germany and convert West Germany into a base for the aggressive Western bloc, precursor of the present Atlantic War pact, created such a stir in 1945 that even the reactionary organ of American monopoly capital "Wall Street Journal", on October 30th 1945, found it too early and too much:

> "We are tending towards a combination supporting the West European bloc. One does not need to support the diplomatic methods of the Soviet Union in order to understand the basis of Russian mistrust on this point... We have conquered Hitler's armies but Hitler's philosophy of force has almost conquered us."

In a declaration to the Investigating Committee of the American Senate at the end of 1945, Russel A. Nixon, who had been entrusted by the United States government with the task of decartellisation of the German trusts, stated:

> "The intensive and irresponsible effort to create disunity between the four powers give rise to the suspicion that certain elements in the State Department, in the Foreign Office and in the French Foreign Ministry intend to create a Western bloc directed against the Soviet Union." (Quoted from: W. G. Burchett: "Cold war in Germany", German edition, Berlin 1950.)

These "certain elements" have proved to be the ruling circles in the imperialist countries.

Contradiction between words and deeds

In the first period after 1945, the imperialist Western powers could not carry out their policy for Germany openly everywhere. The peoples, who had suffered so severely from the acts of aggression of German imperialism, demanded the extirpation of the roots of this aggression, the honest carrying out of the directives with this aim which were contained in the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements, and the restoration and safeguarding of a lasting peace.

In addition a number of honest democrats were still working in the organisations of the Western occupation powers in West Germany and Berlin, and these people supported the principles of friendly cooperation between the great powers and loyalty to treaty obligations.

Thus in the first period after the unconditional surrender of Hitler Germany the Western powers found it necessary to support a policy of cooperation and loyalty to treaty obligations, at least in words. In practice, the reactionary governments and above all the Western occupation authorities in West Germany and West Berlin gave the lie to their own pious declarations.

Apart from some exceptions in the very first period, all measures were sabotaged which aimed at punishing the war criminals and depriving them of power, or at removing the basis of aggressive German imperialism and militarism. The powers of aggressive German imperialism and militarism were preserved and saved from total destruction. The Investigating Committee of the American Senate already quoted had recommended to the US government in 1945, after thorough investigations and many hearings, not only the elimination of nazi leaders and militarists but also of German industrial magnates in order "to destroy German imperialism forever and so make the development of a peaceful and democratic Germany possible". (Quoted from: James S. Allen, "World Monopoly and Peace", German edition, Berlin 1951, p. 74.)

This recommendation was entirely in accord with the Potsdam Agreement and the interests of all peace-loving people.

The recommendation was, however, not carried out but simply ignored. Ignored also was a directive from the then Chief of the US General Staff, General Marshall, "for the denazification of important business enterprises in Germany"

which foresaw the arrest of 1800 leading industrial magnates and bankers who were proved to have taken part in war crimes and nazi crimes.

When well meaning subordinate officials actually carried out measures of denazification and demilitarisation these were soon reversed by saboteurs in high office.

The British journalist, W. G. Burchett, who worked in Germany for more than three years as correspondent for the Conservative British newspaper "Daily Express", stated in his book "Cold war in Germany":

> "Militarism in Germany was to have been destroyed and never to have threatened world peace again. After the first few months of the occupation, the Western powers worried very little about this principle which was opposed to the personal views of the leading officials of the Control Council."

Further he said:

> "There was a planned intrigue to restore the rulership of junkers and Ruhr industrialists, to prevent the social reforms long overdue in Germany and to turn West Germany into a jumping-off ground for a future attack on the Soviet Union." (W. G. Burchett "Cold war in Germany", German edition, Berlin 1950, p. 12, 13 and 15.)

Giving evidence before an official American investigation commission in 1949, Mr. Lawrence Wilkinson, who had first been head of the Industrial Department of American Military Government and later personal economic adviser to General Clay stated:

> "To hell with demilitarisation of Germany. We want to restore the trusts and give the factories back to their nazi owners and directors."

The Western powers have, as is well-known, fulfilled this to the letter in West Germany.

Business friends and allies

The representatives of the imperialist forces, the American monopolies and British and French big business held the key positions in the Military Governments of the Western powers. They gave their protection to all their old German business friends, who had now become their junior partners and allies. Even in 1945 this was an open secret. The American Senator, George Menders, stated in the Senate National Defence Committee that General Draper, who was acting as General Clay's adviser in German economic questions, had formerly, as Vice-President of the great banking house of Dillon Read & Co., personally approved the loans made by this banking house to Germany between the two world wars. In the House of Representatives the Democratic Representative, Jerry Voorhis, stated:

> "Many of the American officials in key positions in the Allied Control Commission are members of firms which were formerly associated with German industrial enterprises. Such a policy is a mistake which can have serious consequences for the future peace of the world."

The representatives of the American, British and French monopolies in the Military Governments, naturally did not hesitate to loot their German competitors and to steal their production secrets, their patents and their methods. But apart from this they made sure that the aggressive forces of German imperialism were preserved.

The democratic elements in the Military Administrations of the Western powers, particularly in the American Military Administration, were forced into a corner by the all-powerful representatives of the monopolies and, in so far as they opposed the policy of resuscitating German imperialism, were squeezed out altogether.

The former chief correspondent of the American newspaper "New York Times', Delbert Clark, who spent nearly two years in Germany after 1945, wrote in this connection:

> "The protagonists of this course... were aware during the first period that American public opinion would not tolerate a complete reversal of policy so soon after the war. It was, therefore, necessary to proceed slowly by degrees, to frustrate agreed policy by a series of cunning tricks... As time went on more and more honest and capable officials were fired because they were not convinced that a complete breach with Russia was necessary or desirable." (Delbert Clark: "Again the Goosestep", New York, 1949, p. 56.)

What was the result of this policy?

> "Clay was able to hand over the Civil Administration to High Commissioner McCloy with a pleasant feeling that he had fulfilled his task. German heavy industry and its nazi directors were saved... nothing more could happen to the German trusts." (W. G. Burchett "Cold war in Germany", German edition, Berlin 1950, p. 251.)

The game of sabotage

The preservation and rescuscitation of the forces of aggressive German imperialism would have been impossible if the four-power administration responsible for all questions of all-German importance had functioned as the Potsdam Agreement had foreseen. In order to prevent it functioning like this the Western powers, while carrying out a separatist policy in their occupation zones, simultaneously sabotaged the cooperation of the great powers by attempting to isolate the representative of the Soviet Union; by foiling all attempts to set up central administrative organs for the whole of Germany as laid down by the Potsdam Agreement; and by systematically preparing and carrying out the partitioning of Germany and the conversion of West Germany into the main base of United States aggression in Europe. For the separatist policy of the western powers

> "it was necessary to split Germany into two halves, to keep the representative of the Soviet Union away from the conference table and to throw the Potsdam Agreement overboard once and for all. The first preparations were made before the blood of allied soldiers was yet dry on

German soil; results showed themselves in the first months of activity of the Control Council." (W. G. Burchett, "Cold war in Germany" as above, p. 217.)

The Western powers soon developed a system of sabotage by which important four power decisions could always be prevented. The French representative particularly frequently made four power agreements in the Control Council impossible by his veto. He did this either on the instructions of, or at least with the silent approval of, his two partners in the plot. Sometimes too it was the British or the American representative who vetoed any decisions which might have brought a peaceful solution of the German question nearer.

This play-acting was stage managed by American Military Government which attempted to mislead the population of the United States and public opinion in other countries by complaining about the incomprehensible stubbornness of the French or the British. For instance, General Clay, one of the main warmongers, and the man chiefly responsible for splitting Germany blamed the French representative, General Koeltz, for the formation of the bi-zone, in his book "Decision in Germany" (p. 164). General Koeltz was responsible for the formation of the bi-zone, one of the first open steps to the splitting of Germany, because in 1945 and 1946 he had consistently refused the formation of a central transport administration for the whole of Germany, according to General Clay. Koeltz was of the opinion that a German railway administration was just as dangerous as a German General Staff.

There is no intention of relieving the representatives of the reactionary French Military Government of their responsibility for splitting Germany, but General Clay knows perfectly well that it was he, himself, who was mainly responsible for splitting Germany and creating war hysteria. It was General Clay who wanted to start a third world war in connection with the so-called Berlin conflict.

An official American report to President Truman on the work of the Control Council states:

"Repeated attempts to reach a common policy on treating the German railways, postal system and other important services as nation-wide systems have broken down largely because of the stubborn opposition of the French. As a result of the French attitude Germany is not being treated as an economic unit. Frankly speaking, France wants instead the economic partitioning of Germany. This is ... I believe, a certain step towards future international friction." (Documents on American Foreign Relations. p. 256 et seq.)

James P. Warburg, in his book "Germany, bridge or battlefield", (p. 33) repeated this charge against the French Military Government:

> "... The French sabotaged all decisions of the Inter-Allied Control Council in which Germany was treated as a political and economic unit ... The French for this reason opposed free interzonal trade and the economic coordination of the four occupation zones. They opposed the licensing of political parties on a national basis. They opposed the proposal to allow German Trade Unions for the whole area of Germany. They met everything with a veto, even the introduction of a uniform postage stamp for all four zones of Germany."

It is noteworthy in connection with these open accusations against the French government of causing the splitting of Germany and preventing the treatment of Germany as a unit, that only a short time later the American government was making the same charges against the representative of the Soviet Union. The American government thus levelled its charges at the only power which since 1945 in the Control Council, at all Foreign Ministers' Conferences, and at other international conferences, had always raised the demand for the treatment of Germany as a whole and who had submitted and supported a number of specific proposals on how to achieve German unity. All these proposals were rejected or sabotaged by the Western powers.

The French Military Government was only allowed to follow its policy of obstruction in the Control Council because this policy was in the interests of the ruling circles of the United States and was, therefore, tolerated by them. That it was simply play-acting may be seen from the attitude of the French government towards the formation of the West German separatist state, the revival of the most aggressive and reactionary forces of German imperialism and the rearmament of the German militarists. Formerly the French Military Government described the formation of all-German progressive trade unions and the issue of all-German postage stamps as inconsistent with France's security. Now, however, they swallow, with astonishing ease, West German armies armed with tanks and a more or less badly camouflaged German General Staff. The "opposition" of the French government to the encouragement and arming of German militarism in West Germany at an ever speedier rate has proved to be just an "opposition" for internal consumption, intended to mislead the French people. The French people will, however, not allow themselves to be swindled a second time. They have experienced themselves where this road ends.

In his book, "Cold war in Germany", W. G. Burchett gives this estimate of the role played by the French Military Government in sabotaging the directives of the Potsdam Agreement:

> "The Americans tolerated independent ways of thought so long as it suited them and no longer. *The French were allowed to oppose the formation of a central government in Germany so long as this spared the Americans the unpleasant duty of carrying out the agreements made in Potsdam. They welcomed the French opposition to Soviet proposals for the unification of Germany so long as this deepened the antagonism between East and West. However, as soon as the act of splitting had been completed the French had to withdraw their objection* ... The same applies to the British plans ... They were tolerated as long as they did not clash with the interests of the Americans. Then they were speedily returned to the files."

Naturally there are considerable differences of interest between the imperialist Western powers on the question of West German remilitarisation and the reestablishment of aggressive German imperialism, and new differences arise daily. The reactionary governments of Great Britain and France have, however,

become so dependent on the United States that in their German policies too they do not dare to take a serious independent line, even though, under the pressure of their peoples, they sometimes try to slow down the speed of their march, with the United States imperialists, towards the abyss.

Splitting Germany — a step along the road of US aggression

After the Western powers had crippled the work of the Control Council for Germany to all intents and purposes, by preventing mutual agreement being reached, the extent and urgency of the danger of a lasting partitioning of Germany was shown by the agreement on the formation of the bi-zone reached by the British and American Military Governments on December 2nd 1946. It became ever clearer that the Western powers aimed to establish a West German separatist state controlled by them, in which the occupation regime was to be continued interminably and was to be accompanied by the refusal of a peace treaty. The two things are closely connected since a peace treaty obviously removes the reason for occupation troops to remain any longer on German territory, and makes questionable the usefulness of West Germany as base for the planned American war of aggression. American officials have declared publicly that the United States intend to keep their troops in West Germany for an unlimited period. American diplomats and military men have mentioned an occupation lasting from 10 to 25, or even from 50 to 60 years. United States Secretary of State Acheson has hinted that it might last another 50 years until the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany. The American imperialists hate the idea of a peace treaty like the plague. (Figures mentioned above were given in the course of the Paris Conference of the four Foreign Ministers in 1949.)

In spring 1947 Hoover, the former President of the United States, after a trip to Germany publicly proposed the formation of a West German separate government. This was the sign that the completion of the splitting of Germany was reaching a decisive stage. Public opinion in the United States and the world was to be accustomed to the measures of partition which were about to follow. In this situation the Soviet Government took new and urgent steps to ensure the realisation of the agreements which had been signed, to treat Germany as an economic and political unit and to conclude a peace treaty with an all-German government without further delay by the Western powers. This was the aim of the definitive proposals made by Mr. V. M. Molotov at the Foreign Ministers' Conference, held from March 10th to April 24th 1947 in Moscow. He proposed the immediate establishment of central all-German administrative bodies for industry, agriculture, finance, transport and foreign trade, as the precondition for ensuring the economic unity of Germany and in preparation for the conclusion of a peace treaty with a German central government. All these proposals were rejected or thwarted by the Western powers.

The Western powers, under the leadership of the American imperialists, now began the series of separate conferences and separate decisions calamitous for Germany and for peace, which deepened step by step the partitioning of Germany. Even during the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Moscow a separate agreement was reached in New York about the export of German coal, and

the Soviet Union was intentionally excluded from the decision on this issue of all-German importance. Other conferences followed: the Marshall Plan Conference in Paris at which it was decided to include West Germany in the aggressive Marshall plan; a separate three power conference in London which took unilateral decisions about the level of industrial production which had been laid down in the Potsdam Declaration, and a number of other separate conferences which have continued until the present day. At recent conferences definite decisions have been taken on the number of offensive weapons, tanks and bombers to be put at the disposal of the West German militarists.

The partitioning of Germany took ever more threatening forms. German patriots finally concentrated their hopes on the London Conference of the four powers beginning in November 1947 which was intended to restore four power administration and discuss the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

Long before this London Conference of Foreign Ministers began the American government had decided to disrupt it and to prevent any agreement being reached. W. G. Burchett, British journalist, whose book has been quoted many times, reports on page 255 et. seq. a conversation with a small circle of persons in Berlin, including Mr. Richard Scammon, head of the political section of the Civil Affairs Administration of American Military Government. The present Lord Mayor of West Berlin, Reuter, one of the worst German warmongers, was among those present. It should be noted that the following conversation took place only a few weeks before the beginning of the four power conference on November 25th 1947. "It is simply terrible", Mr. Scammon complained, "that the State Department is always limping along six months behind us. They have only just approved our demand for a West German separate state and we have had everything prepared for the last six months ... When the peace statute (he meant the Occupation Statute, ed.) is signed we shall be able to make West Germany our ally. We shall include it with all its heavy industry as the 17th nation in the Marshall Plan, and we will then have 44 million more people on our side. In a few months we will be equipped down to the last button ready to march." On another occasion he supplemented this by stating: "We shall naturally have to use the Germans." Later developments have shown that Scammon was excellently informed.

Burchett's report continues:

> "'Naturally we shall then be ready to strike.' Scammon, a giant with a rosy round child's face, grinned at me as if to an innocent boy. 'But we shall certainly be ready. I have been busy lately drafting a memorandum about our occupation policy in the Soviet Union.' And Scammon, who could see himself as a future Gauleiter, went on to discuss seriously what one should do with the collective farms and the factories. He thought one could leave the collective farms as they are; after all American experts found that this was an economical method. But what about industry? This would have to be — and he actually used the word — 'decartellised'."

One could regard these declarations by a leading official of the American Military Government, Mr. Scammon, as the chatter of a lunatic if one did not know that months before Hitler's attacks on the Soviet Union German "experts" had

had the same sort of "technical discussions". Long before the attack on the Soviet Union the staffs had been assembled, ready to take over the political and economic administration in Moscow, Leningrad, Astrakhan and the Urals after the expected lightning war. The future Gauleiters had their bags packed when the war started and they felt certain that they would be taking up their new jobs of governing in a few days or weeks. One can, therefore, not dismiss Scammon's declarations as idiotic nonsense. They show the extent of the war preparation policy of the United States and how far the help of old nazi experts on this subject would be used.

On October 18th 1947 the Berlin correspondent of the "New York Post" was able to report to his paper:

> "A number of officials of the American Military Government have prophesied unanimously that the London Conference will run into a dead end and that the West German rump republic will then be formed."

The New York weekly "Newsweek" had been able to report on July 24th 1947: "Official personalities in Washington believe that the continuation of the present four power regime would result in Communism throughout Germany. It would be preferable to save one part of Germany for the Western powers. For this reason the question of establishing a separate government for West Germany is being studied."

These quotations prove that the American imperialists had taken the finalisation of the partitioning of Germany and the formation of a separate Western state into their programme months before the London four power conference, which was so decisive for Germany. Already at that date their aim was to use West German industrial potential and reserves of manpower for American war plans. General Clay, too, confirms this in his book "Decision in Germany".

The American delegation went to the London Conference with the intention of torpedoing every agreement which might prevent the separation of West Germany and the formation of a West German separatist state.

At this London Conference the Soviet Union tried to save the unity of Germany a number of times. Molotov proposed the immediate creation of a democratic German central government and the holding of a peace conference which should work out a peace treaty with Germany without delay. Marshall, at that time US Secretary of State, the American delegation and their British and French satellites, disrupted the conference.

With satisfaction the "New York Herald Tribune" commented on the breakdown of the London Foreign Ministers' Conference on December 20th 1947:

> "We have reached the end of the road. The age of Yalta is past... The division of Germany will give us a free hand to include West Germany in a system of the Western states."

After the American warmongers had overcome the serious obstacle of the London four power conference the process of splitting Germany was greatly speeded up. The Potsdam Agreement was broken more and more often. Breaches of treaty by the Western powers became a daily occurrence, a habit. One

separate conference followed on the heels of another. A bargain was struck with the French government for the French zone to join the bi-zone and the conditions were discussed under which the French government would agree to the formation of a West German separatist state. Preparations were made for the separation of the Ruhr area through the Ruhr statute etc.

When the preparations for the formation of the West German separatist state were, to all intents and purposes, completed, the plan for the partitioning of Germany, which had been decided long before, was published on June 8th 1948 as the so-called "London Recommendations".

On June 18th 1948 one of the heaviest blows at German unity followed: the separate currency reform in the three Western zones after the United States and her satellites had foiled arrangements for an all-German currency reform. This separate currency reform in West Germany split Germany into two currency areas with all the consequences which that entailed for internal German trade and above all for Berlin. The separate currency reform in West Germany provided the main excuse for the so-called "Berlin conflict" which exposed with particular clarity the war policy of the United States government.

The British journalist Burchett, quoted above, describes a conversation with General Clay's financial adviser: "'It looks as if it will not be possible to avoid the introduction of a common currency', he said, adding bitterly 'Clay must have been out of his mind when he declared that we should try once again to attain a unified currency reform. Now, we are in for it. The Russians have said yes to everything and it is going to be damnably difficult for us to get out of it.'"

The American imperialists naturally managed to "get out of it", they prevented the creation of a unified currency and carried out the division of Germany in regard to currency too.

The Allied Control Council ceased to function as a result of the separatist policy of the Western powers and the splitting off of the Western zones. In May 1949 the four Foreign Ministers met again for a joint conference in Paris. At this Foreign Ministers' meeting too the Soviet delegation made last minute efforts to prevent the disastrous splitting of Germany. They proposed that the draft of a peace treaty with Germany should be presented within three months. This peace treaty should include the condition that all occupation troops leave Germany within a year after its signature. The Soviet delegation further proposed that an all-German state council be created from representatives of the economic organs in existence in the East zone and in the West zones. This council was to be an economic and administrative centre with government functions for the whole of Germany and should ensure a further development in the spirit of German unity.

The Western powers frustrated this attempt by the Soviet Union too. A number of definite decisions taken about the extension of interzonal trade and the resumption of four power consultations in Berlin were, in the main, not carried out by the Western occupation powers.

General Clay was very worried about the "danger" that the Foreign Ministers might still reach unanimity about a united Germany. In his book "Decision in Germany" he states:

"I was afraid the Soviet representatives might agree to our conditions for the formation of an all-German government... I was glad when this did not happen."

In this connection General Clay confirms once again that the "construction of the West German government was completed before the four Foreign Ministers met in Paris on May 23rd 1949".

The American newspaper "Washington Post" was able to report on May 16th 1949, a week before the Foreign Ministers met:

"A government for the three Western zones of Germany will be established in any case. Most administrative jobs will probably be taken over by the representatives of business. The CSU/CDU will be the apparent government and behind them the industrialists will really control Germany."

The formation of the West German separatist state put the seal on the splitting of Germany. The American warmongers had achieved their goal. The reestablishment of German imperialism and militarism, the conversion of West Germany into the main base for American aggression in Europe were, from this time on, pressed ahead with increasing lack of concealment.

Adenauer's "conscience" and Schumacher's "disappointment"

The Western powers who split Germany under the leadership of aggressive American imperialism would not have been able to reach their goal without the active assistance of the German monopolists, their political exponents, and the right-wing leadership of the Social-Democratic Party and the Trade Unions. The American imperialists have acted in close cooperation with the reactionary party leaderships which contain many of their paid agents, particularly in the Christian Democratic Union and the Social-Democratic Party, in all their attacks on the vital interests of the German people. This cooperation has the aim of preparing West Germany for war and wants for this purpose to defraud the West German population, divert their attention from essential matters and to weaken their resistance to the partitioning of Germany and the infringement of the vital interests of the German nation. Adenauer and Schumacher had taken on the task of frustrating every attempt to reach understanding and unity by Germans in East and West, of misleading the population of West Germany and preparing them for the intended partitioning. They had taken on this job even before the notorious London Recommendations of the Western powers, which had prepared the splitting of Germany, the separate currency reform in West Germany, the formation of the separate West German state, the Occupation Statute and the Ruhr Statute. When, after the publication of the London Recommendations, a wave of indignation shook the German people, Adenauer and Schumacher did not dare to confess to their share in the splitting. They "opposed" in words these London Recommendations in order to prevent the population of West Germany from taking action to stop the realisation of the London plans for partition, and in order to persuade the population that their interests were in good hands.

Adenauer and Schumacher were actually thoroughly informed about the intentions of the imperialist Western powers and had even taken part in the preliminary discussions for the London Recommendations. But now Adenauer who, like Schumacher, follows the American imperalists through thick and thin in all measures directed against the German people, issued a statement which disclosed his hypocricy:

> "The results (of the London Recommendations, ed.) surpass by far the worst expectations...
>
> Things have slowly developed to a point where all Germans, irrespective of the party to which they belong, must ask themselves seriously whether they can answer to their consciences and to their people if they continue to cooperate under conditions in which their freedom is being ever more and more curtailed." ("Die Welt", Hamburg, June 10th 1948.)

Schumacher and the leadership of the Social Democratic Party showed themselves in this instance to be rather less radical than Adenauer. Schumacher had returned a few months earlier from a five-weeks journey through the United States in which he had been brought up to the mark once again in the policy of the American imperialists. On June 9th 1948 his party organ „Sozialdemokrat", tried to avoid making a clear statement but nevertheless let the cat out of the bag stating:

> "Despite some correct assumptions and the realisation that it is necessary to create the required political basis for the inclusion of Germany in European reconstruction (i. e. war preparation, ed.) the London Recommendations will only cause disappointment in Germany."

The most important "political basis" for the American war policy which has been and is unconditionally supported by the right-wing Social Democratic leadership, was the splitting of Germany and the creation of the West German separate state, in which both Adenauer and Schumacher wholeheartedly cooperated. Adenauer conquered his "conscience" and Schumacher his "disappointment". Adenauer and Schumacher together forced through the London Recommendations against the will of the West German population and they carried out the splitting of Germany. It was Adenauer and Schumacher who supported in the Bonn parliament the Occupation Statute and the Ruhr Statute and all measures which helped to split Germany.

"Foreign policy towards the East"

In order to prepare war Germany was split by the American imperialists, their British and French satellites and the West German politicians who clamoured for "revenge".

The statement by the American High Commissioner, McCloy that he and his friends had been working towards this goal continuously since 1945 is undoubtedly true.

This political line is the line of treaty breaking, the cheating of the peoples, including one's own people, the reestablishment of predatory, aggressive German imperialism and militarism, the preparation of a war against the

most progressive country in the world, the Soviet Union, and other peace-loving countries. It is an old political line which ended with dishonourable failure in the wars of intervention against the young Soviet state. It is the old political line which revived German imperialism after the First World War and brought Hitler to power. It is the old bankrupt political line which led to the hell of the Second World War with its concentration and extermination camps. It is the old bankrupt political line which cost the lives of 27 million persons in the Second World War and caused the destruction of tens of thousands of towns and villages. The American High Commissioner McCloy his British and French colleagues and the West German "revenge" politicians boast today of following the same old line under the changed conditions which have prevailed since 1945.

They have achieved something. Germany has been split in two parts. In West Germany the monopolists and junkers, acting as the junior partners of the US monopolists, control West German economy and have a decisive voice in the fate of the country. An ultra-reactionary government is in the saddle in West Germany, obediently carrying out every order of the American imperialists. This government has established a police regime which describes every progressive movement, every discussion about war and peace, every conversation between friends and acquaintances across the zonal frontiers as political crime and persecutes it.

This reactionary West German government is about to drive German youth into the barrack squares and into the mass graves of a Third World War on the orders of the American monopolists. Hitler's bankrupt generals, who have the lives of millions on their consciences, have reached the top again in West Germany together with leaders of war economy, military governors, SS-generals, nazi gauleiters and Gestapo brutes.

It has got as far as this in West Germany today:

> "A new foreign policy directed towards the East ... but Germany has a more extensive role to play. We are thinking of the necessity of winning back our Eastern neighbors for the Western world to which they belong by nature. It is necessary to break ... the spell ... We who live in the pattern of the Western world are best qualified—both in a good and bad sense—to show those on the other side of the iron curtain ... what the Western world means by freedom and the dignity of man."

That is a verbatim quotation from an article written by Herr Otto Klepper in the West German newspaper "Frankfurter Allgemeine", No. 149, of June 20th 1951. He probably derives his qualifications for "winning back our Eastern neighbours for the Western world" from the fact that Hitler too once untertook such a "salvation attempt". The "salvation for the Western world" led to the gas chambers of the extermination camps. McCloy should congratulate this murderous scribbler. Rosenberg and Goebbels could not have done it any better.

The fact that a leading newspaper in West Germany can, in the year 1951, call openly for the conquest of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria is also a result of the untiring work done by McCloy and his colleagues since 1945. The French, British and American peoples will still remember clearly phrases like these from the imperialist German war propaganda.

II.

GERMAN IMPERIALISM GREEDY FOR WAR–CHIEF ALLY OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

1. West German armament potential 43

2. West Germany—most dangerous breeding ground of aggression in Europe 47

3. Exploiting the plight of resettlers 51

4. West Germany's role in relation to the peoples of Europe 53

For a considerable period, at least since the beginning of the Marshall Plan policy, American imperialism showed the tendency to make German imperialism its main ally. The entire economic policy of the American occupation officials who control the economic development of West Germany is aimed towards this end. All the agreements reached by the Allies during the war and after it had ended aimed at making a peaceful development of the German economy possible but these agreements have been purposely and systematically torn up in West Germany. The head of the Decartellisation Bureau of American Military Government, James Martin, who resigned his post in July 1947, declared on his arrival in New York:

> "I have resigned in protest against the intrigues of the great American companies in Germany, in particular the General Electric Company, General Motors and the Standard Oil Company. The American people are led by monopolistic groups who have their own ideas of how to treat Germany. My efforts were frustrated by the American groups interested, who want to establish in the heart of Europe a Germany controlled by monopolists."

Mr. Martin was not the first Military Government official to resign because he saw how impossible it was to carry out economic measures which would guarantee a peaceful development of the German economy, in the face of the opposition of the American monopolists. He was not the last official either. Before him Colonel Bernstein and Russel A. Nixon had left their positions for the same reasons and in May 1948 19 officials of the staff of the Decartellisation Department of the American Military Government protested against American occupation policy.

The intention of making the German monopolists the main allies of American imperialism can be seen clearly from the report of the co-called "Harriman Committee" set up to investigate the question of "foreign aid" in preparation for the Marshall Plan. This report, dated November 8th 1947 stated:

> "No portion of the economic aid which the states represented on the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation have requested, is of greater fundamental importance than that which should serve to restore to health the industry, the agriculture and the transport system of Germany."

The particular care which American imperialists lavished on the German monopolists may be clearly seen from the fact that the economic development of West Germany since the beginning of the Marshall Plan has gone ahead considerably faster than in the other countries of Western Europe.

The reasons for the particular care shown by American imperialism for the German monopolists are manifold and must be considered in detail.

1. West German armament potential

One of the most important reasons for the reestablishment of German imperialism and its treatment as chief ally of American imperialism is the strength of the West German war potential and the existence of officers with war experience.

The Teheran Declaration signed on December 1st 1943 by Generalissimo Stalin, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill stated:

> "No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea and their war plants from the air."

The destruction of the German war potential was thus an openly declared Allied war aim. How was it put into practice by the Anglo-American military leadership? The delay in opening a Second Front in Europe has been dealt with in another place. What was the position in regard to the destruction of war plants from the air?

The Anglo-American airraids were directed only in exceptional cases against industrial targets and their main objectives were the residential areas of the German population. Neither German coal production nor iron and steel production were seriously reduced by air attacks. Although the coal mines and steel foundries of the Ruhr were near-range targets for the Anglo-American bomber squadrons, and although they made excellent targets, only about 2 % of the coal production and 5 % of the iron and steel production were crippled by airraids, according to an official American investigation. On the other hand the residential areas of the Ruhr workers were laid in ruins by pitiless airraids.

The report of a secret investigation into the effectiveness of American air attacks on Germany stated:

> "The Allies did not try to destroy the German economy as a whole *or even the war economy as a whole.*"

According to this investigation, which was carried out by "The United States Strategic Bombing Survey", German armament production figures despite the tremendous bombardment reached in 1944 some 280 % of the 1942 production figures. Even in March 1945 when a great part of German territory was already occupied, arms production was still 45 % more than the 1942 average. Tank production reached its highest figure in the fourth quarter in 1944 and even in the first quarter of 1945 it was still three and a half times as high as in the first quarter of 1942. German aircraft production rose to 15,000 planes in 1942, in 1943 it exceeded 25,000 planes and in 1944 reached nearly 40,000 planes. All these figures taken from the secret report of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey prove that the warfare waged by the Western powers in no way served to destroy fascist arms industry.

On December 12th 1945 Colonel Bernstein made the following statement on the elimination of the German arms industry to the Senate Military Affairs Sub-Committee:

> "I believe that in previous hearings of your committee testimony was given that 75 % of German industry was intact or could easily be restored. My own investigation and studies show that this is actually a minimum. It is a minimum in the case of IG Farben where we have found that probably 87 % can be put into operation and if the Germans have three or six months time for repairs then a much greater part would be in a position to start production."

("Elimination of German resources for war" Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate, 74,241, Washington 1946, p. 1,113.)

The huge administrative building of the IG Farben trust in Frankfurt/Main was left absolutely untouched by air-raids and the enormous factory installations of IG Farben were only slightly damaged. (Only two of 55 factories in the American zone were damaged.) The beautiful old city of Frankfurt with Goethe's birthplace and many other treasures was found without difficulty, however, and laid in ruins by American pilots. At a secret meeting of the production department of IG Farben on February 27th 1945 it was announced that with regard to power production only about 16,5 % of the total has been stopped for a period by the bombing.

In 1936 there were a total of 82 blast-furnaces in Rhineland and Westphalia but in 1947 the number had increased to 118. In the same period the number of Thomas and Bessemer furnaces had increased from 54 to 67 and the number Siemens-Martins furnaces from 184 to 213. These figures and facts show clearly that the warfare of the American imperialists aimed at sparing German war potential and that so far as West Germany was concerned the arms plants were in the main preserved and at the end of the war could still produce more than at the beginning. In the Eastern part of Germany, where the fascists waged war with great ferocity, hundreds of factories were wrecked in the bitter land battles.

Just as it was one of the war aims of the anti-Hitler coalition to destroy German arms plants it was also a peace aim to remove war industry and guarantee a peaceful economic development for Germany. The Potsdam Declaration laid down in unmistakable terms:

> "In order to eliminate Germany's war potential, the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, as well as all types of aircraft and seagoing ships shall be prohibited and prevented."

In accordance with this decision a plan was drawn up for the elimination of the arms industry in the whole of Germany. In the Western zones, however, the policy of American imperialism saw to it that the Potsdam decisions were ignored and that the arms factories remained. The possibility of dismantling was, however, used in order to damage peace industry and to eliminate undesirable German competition. An example of this can be seen in the fact that the French occupation authorities, with the approval of the American authorities dismantled more than half the capacity of the Black Forest clock-making industry.

As early as February and March 1946 this policy of the American occupation power was disclosed to a Senate Committee by Russel A. Nixon. He quoted among others the example of the IG factory "Anorgana" in Gendorf. During the war the factory produced only poison gas and the director of the financial department of US military government, Mr. Dodge, therefore, ordered its immediate closing on October 18th 1945. However, the director of the economic department, General Draper, in civil life Vice-President of the Wall Street banking house Dillon Read & Co., insisted on production continuing because the products were urgently needed.

Mr. Nixon also proved that not a single factory of IG Farben was earmarked for reparation or dismantling, although they were all war factories. The three factories marked down for dismantling were in fact state property and had only been administered by IG Farben. When these factories were in fact dismantled the equipment was sent to various IG enterprises instead of being used for reparations.

A secret memorandum entitled "The development of the dismantling question" drawn up by the management of the "Badische Anilin- und Soda-fabrik" in Ludwigshafen, read like a joke. According to this memorandum a total of 59 war installations were earmarked for dismantling at the end of 1947. "As a result of the first negotiations this list was reduced to . . . 47 installations." Further negotiations resulted in 23 of these being struck off the list so that only 24 installations remained. Up to the end of 1949 another 11 installations were struck off the list leaving only 13 from the original 59. Even these 13 installations were not dismantled, but only a small quantity of machinery, laboratory and reserve equipment which could easily be replaced was dismantled.

Despite the Potsdam decisions the arms industry of West Germany was left practically untouched. Even the late British Foreign Minister, Bevin, was obliged to admit the complete bankruptcy of the policy of economic disarmament in a speech in the House of Commons on July 22nd 1949:

> "In Moscow I made a promise which I was not able to keep and the Russians cannot forgive me for it. I had said that by July 1948 the dismantling of all arms factories of the so-called category 1 would be concluded. I have done what I could to keep this promise but our allies made the greatest difficulties."

Asked who had made these difficulties Bevin replied:

> "The Americans kept on changing their point of view and bringing in completely new proposals."

In actual fact West German arms potential was not only scarcely reduced but actually constantly increased in some branches. After the American imperialists had made sure that West German industry would remain firmly in the hands of the German monopolists they did everything they could to strengthen it. From the separate currency reform in 1948 up to 1950 a total of 42.8 thousand million marks were newly invested in West German industry. That is an average of 17 thousand million marks yearly. This sum was mainly invested in the industrial branches important for war controlled by the West German monopolists and was used to extend the armament potential. Particularily important were the mining industry and the chemical industry owned by war criminals.

The capacity for steel production and the production of a whole series of chemicals important for war is today bigger in West Germany than it was before the Second World War in the whole of Germany. Even the American High Commissioner McCloy cannot avoid stating in his report for the period from October 1st to December 31st 1950:

> "West Germany is still the main European supplier of certain chemicals important for armaments." (Fifth Quarterly Report of the American High Commissioner for Germany, p. 35.)

We must be grateful to this report for the way in which it discloses the reason for American imperialism giving its support to the West German monopolists who provide, now as then, the strong West German war potential. That part of the report under the title: "The economic side of the defence problem" states that in 1938 one third of the entire European industrial production came from Germany. In addition the report states:

> "The bulk of the German pre-war heavy industrial capacity which is necessary for a defence contribution lies within the area of the Federal Republic. This industrial capacity, which was once mobilised against Europe, can today contribute greatly to the needs of the defence both of Germany and of the Atlantic powers." (ibid.)

West German industry would have great possibilities of serving peaceful purposes and could do a lot to raise the standard of living of the German people. However, under the threadbare excuse of "defence", an excuse already misused by Hitler, it has become, in the hands of the monopolists and under the control of the American imperialists, an instrument of war, a means to destroy immeasurable values and the most precious thing of all—human life.

That is the main reason why the American imperialists have reestablished German imperialists as their main allies.

2. West Germany — most dangerous breeding ground of aggression in Europe

The American imperialists are preparing war. The aggression they plan is directed against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. For this war they need allies who are ready to join in the American plans and to make these plans their own. The allies of American imperialism must be just as aggressive and bloodthirsty as that imperialism itself.

German monopoly capital is such an ally, an ally marked out by an immeasurable lust for aggression. That is why the American imperialists have made it their chief ally.

In the First World War the German monopolists gave proof of their lust for aggression and their boundless expansionism in the infamous memorandum of the Central Association of German industrialists, the Federation of Industrialists and other economic associations. This memorandum, which was signed by Stinnes among others, demanded not only the "Anschluss" of Belgium but also "the possession of the coastal areas bordering on Belgium up to about the Somme, thus providing access to the Atlantic Ocean". In addition the French Channel ports, the iron ore area of Briey, the fortresses of Verdun and Belfort, "the coal area of the Departement du Nord and of the Pas de Calais", as well as the "economic means of power including the middle-sized and large properties in this area" should all fall to the Germans. In the East claim was laid to a similarily extensive "agricultural area" including the Baltic provinces of Russia, today the Soviet republics of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, together with "the areas lying south thereof".

Everyone knows how this first great German imperialistic adventure ended. But the defeat in the First World War in no way damped the ardour of German

imperialism. Its programme of aggression for the Second World War was, if possible, even more boundless. The areas demanded stretched from the Pyrennees to the Caucasus, from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean and beyond. The Second World War ended, however, with an even more abysmal defeat for German imperialism.

The result of the Second World War was a severe blow for the German monopolists. Their hegemony was broken in about a third of the area of Germany, thirty per cent of the German population could no longer be exploited by them, and an equivalent portion of the industry of the country had been removed from their command. A number of the war criminals' trusts were particularily hard hit by the carrying out of the Potsdam decisions in the Eastern third of Germany, for instance the Flick Konzern, IG Farben, Deutsche Continentale Gasgesellschaft, Deutsche Solvay Werke, AG, and others.

German monopoly capital concentrated in West Germany and attempted to create there anew the positions which it had lost forever in the other part of Germany. Above all it is today trying to convert West Germany into the jumping-off ground for a new bloody war of conquest in agreement with the American imperialists. The one-sided structure of the economy with its emphasis on arms, created by the fascist regime, has been maintained and to some extent even strengthened in West Germany. The chemical industry has exceeded the 1936 production by 47 %, the engineering industry by 54 %, vehicle production by 95 % and the electrical industry by 220 %. The food industry has only just reached pre-war figures despite increased population, the shoe industry has a production 10 % below 1936 and the leather industry a production nearly 30 % lower. This one-sided development of West German industry based on the limitation of consumer goods and the expansion of those branches which work in the first place for rearmament show quite clearly the aims of the monopolists to speed up war preparations.

The aggressive aims of the German monopolists are the same as those they held during the Second World War. They are still dreaming of the "fusion" of the mining and chemical industry of the whole of Europe as a basis for the attack on the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies and for the final battle for the mastery of the world.

The most important step along this path is the so-called Schuman plan for a West European Montan Union. Only a few weeks after the announcement of the "plan" the German monopolists revealed what the Schuman plan really meant to them, and that they hoped to use it to put into effect the old fascist plans of annexation. The following statement was made at the directors' conference of the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry of North Rhine Westphalia:

> "For decades the political unification of Europe has been the unfinished task on the agenda of the conferences and in the hopes of the man in the street. We recall the dreams of Napoleon I, the 'Mitteleuropa' of Friedrich Naumann ... Hitler's 'Greater Europe' ... Now the Schuman plan is making the attempt to bring the political unification of Europe one step nearer by providing a unified production basis for coal and steel in an economically limited territory." (Industriekurier, Dusseldorf, No. 90, June 15th 1950.)

The aims of the Schuman plan are here expressed with brutal frankness. It is designed to achieve by new methods the aggressive plan of German imperialism which have already run on the rocks twice. The plan now is to place the entire West European mining industry, with the aid of the Americans, under the command of the arms kings of the Ruhr, this time in the framework of Adenauer's "greater Europe".

The heavy industry and the entire economy of the West European countries would be handed over on American orders to the war criminals' concerns of German armament capital — Krupp and Thyssen, Mannesmann and Hoesch, Klöckner and Haniel. The lavishly illustrated propaganda pamphlet about the Schuman plan which the Bonn "government" shamefacedly issued anonymously stated clearly:

> "The ratification of the Schuman plan will mean that a decision has been taken for the next fifty years on the most important part of West European economy. Every German ought to study this subject since the production of the Ruhr, the industrial heart of Germany, will be the nucleus of this new economic unit."

In steel and in coal production West Germany takes the first place among the Continental countries of Western Europe, even with her limited production of today. The monthly averages of the first quarter of 1951 showed that she was producing 52 % of the coal and 35 % of the steel of the countries taking part in the Schuman plan. If the potential capacity was used to the full the figures would rise to 60 % of the coal and 57 % of the steel. The control of the German monopolists, within the bounds of the freedom of movement allowed them by American imperialism, is thus ensured.

American imperialism naturally has the deciding word. It intends to use its German allies as policemen and warders in Europe. Even the West German "Volkswirt" let the cat out of the bag a few days after the announcement of the Schuman plan by stating:

> "... The basic thought of the French proposal had already been formulated in the American memorandum on the European steel industry." ("Der Volkswirt", May 12th, 1950.)

The Bonn government in its pamphlet already quoted hypocritically calls the Schuman plan the "way to peace", but those in the know have no doubts that the American planners regard it as the direct road to the war at which they aim. A leading West German newspaper stated in this connection:

> "American approval for the Schuman plan is the expression of a new phase of the foreign economic policy of the United States. To speak in the language of slogans, 'butter' is no longer being provided to strengthen Europe internally. The aim is now 'guns'." ("Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung", May 23rd 1951.)

Through the Schuman plan the heavy industry of the whole West Europe would be converted, in accordance with American wishes, into a single great armaments trust, the European arsenal for American imperialism's war against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. The inclusion of West Germany in the aggressive Atlantic pact system is intended to be complemented in the economic field by the Schuman plan.

The Bonn publication on the Schuman plan states: "The Schuman plan provides more jobs and thus social security."

This statement is a barefaced lie. One of the declared aims of the Schuman plan is to close down those parts of the Montan industry which do not provide the monopolists with high enough profit. However, the bosses of the West German Montan industry attempt to throw the burden of such a policy on the other peoples of Europe. The General Director of the German Coalmining Management, Dr. Kost, a man who ought to know, told a meeting of the Federation of Leading Mining Officials, according to a report in the "Rheinische Zeitung" on June 12th 1950:

> "In the course of the cheapening of West European industrial production those pits which work with too high costs will have to be closed down. There is, however, no doubt that the Ruhr mines produce more cheaply than those in Belgium and the South of France."

But the Belgian and French miners and iron workers are not only going to lose their jobs through the Schuman plan, they will also, like their German colleagues, lose the freedom to chose for themselves where they want to work. The Schuman plan gives the heavy industrial trusts the right to send the workers like slaves from one country to another "at their own discretion", as the forced labourers were deported under fascism and Belgian workers were deported in the First World War. The treatment of West European miners and iron workers as modern serfs of the armaments trusts is intended to smash their trade union and political organisations. It is intended to complete the unlimited control of the German and American monopolists over the Montan industry in the whole of West Europe by introducing American antistrike regulations and by persecuting all progressive movements and particularily all active fighters for peace.

Tearing the most important industries of West Germany from the sovereignty of the German people and putting them under the control of a cosmopolitan "forced cartel of a completely monopolistic kind" ("Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung", March 17th 1951), is not only complete national treachery on the part of the Adenauer government. It is bound to have the most serious results on the living conditions of West German workers. Neither the workers' parties nor the trade unions are intended to have any influence in future on the wage rates and work conditions in the coal and steel industries. Such things will be reserved exclusively for the so-called "high authority" composed of leading representatives of the international arms kings, headed by the infamous representatives of the German arms monopolies. American imperialism, which has reserved the final decisions to itself, lords it over the whole. Adenauer himself admitted this in a concealed form at a press conference on the Schuman plan. According to the "Neue Zeitung", Munich, of April 21st/22nd 1951, he said:

> "After the fusion the treaty partners will be able to get the American credits absolutely necessary for reconstruction and extension work much more easily than if the fusion had not taken place."

The formation of the Montan Union is the most important means by which American imperialism ensures its indirect control over West Europe by

reestablishing and strengthening aggressive German imperialism. The creation of the Montan Union is the most important step on the path to the preparation of a third world war.

3. Exploiting the plight of resettlers

In order to attack the Soviet Union and the European People's Democracies an attack on the German Democratic Republic is the first necessity. A civil war of Germans against Germans is planned as the first stage towards the realisation of the predatory aims of the German monopolists. At the same time the attack on the German Democratic Republic is intended to restore in the first round the positions they lost in the Second World War.

In order to put into effect their criminal aims the German monopolists attempt to create a mass basis for themselves. For this purpose they want to use above all the resettlers.

According to the Bonn Statistical Office there are about 7.8 million resettlers in West Germany. The absorption of the resettlers in normal life has been purposely prevented however, by the Bonn officials. They are not called resettlers but "Heimatvertriebene" (those driven from their homes) in order to foster ideas of aggressive revenge particularily against the People's Democracies of Poland and Czechoslovakia, both among the resettlers themselves and among the rest of the population. A land reform like that which was carried out in the then Soviet occupation zone of Germany would have provided 190,000 new farms in the three Western zones and thus have given this number of resettler families a new home. The prevention of land reform is not the only measure, however, which has been taken against the resettlers and made their absorption in the life of the people impossible. The integration of resettlers in normal working life is being systematically hindered and only made possible in those jobs which are particularily badly paid or which are unpopular on account of the heaviness of the work.

According to the official figures, about which more must be said later, resettlers make up 16,4 % of the entire population of West Germany. Their proportion among the unemployed in March 1951 was, however, 33,4 %, almost exactly twice as high. This means that although only every sixth West German is a resettler, every third unemployed person is a resettler. Unemployment is thus in the first place borne by the resettlers.

Among unemployed textile workers on March 31st 1951 the resettlers made up 40 %. They were 53.2 % of the unemployed landworkers, herdsmen and gardeners and actually 55 % of the glass workers.

According to the German language paper of the American intervention troops "Die Neue Zeitung" on March 30th 1950, resettlers who have jobs make up 50 % of those working in "unpopular work". An investigation by the Kiel Institute for World Economy stated:

> A disproportionally high percentage of labourers and workers in the less popular jobs are composed of people from elsewhere ... the majority of

6257

the refugees cannot be used and cannot earn according to their capabilities."

("The German Refugee Problem" by Dr. F. Edding, Dr. F. E. Hornschu and Hilde Wander, Kiel, February 1949.)

The Evangelical Aid Society makes the following report on the housing conditions of the resettlers:

"The refugees live 50 % more crowdedly than the native population. 22 % of all reported refugees have no bed."

("Die Stimme der Vertriebenen", Hamburg, August 17th 1950.)

The German monopolists and their government in Bonn not only have no desire to help the resettlers, they do everything they can to perpetuate their misery. The number of resettlers quoted by the statistics issued in Bonn, 7.8 million, is actually 600,000 more than the number of those who really used to live in the former Eastern territories. Only 7,2 million of the present population of West Germany used to live outside the present German frontiers as laid down by international decisions. The West German statistics, however, "reckon a child born in wedlock as a refugee if the father is a refugee and reckon an illegitimate child if the mother is a refugee" ("Wirtschaft und Statistik", June 1950, No. 3, p. 78). That is to say that the resettlers in West Germany are not expected to disappear but that they are being preserved by the German monopolists as a hereditary cast of outcasts and pariahs.

The reason for this is openly admitted by the "Bund der Heimatlosen und Entrechteten" (Federation of the Homeless and those deprived of their rights), an organisation set up by the monopolists to exploit to the full the plight of the resettlers created and perpetuated by the monopolists themselves. A statement issued by the BHE says:

"The foreign political aim of the BHE is to win back the Eastern territories illegally taken from us. We do not believe that it is sufficient to demand the return of these territories. We regard it as our duty to hold ourselves ready for our return to these territories. That will not be possible with human wrecks who are forced to vegetate in emergency billets... We believe that every German who is serious about winning back the Eastern territories must regard it as his obligation to create the basis for winning back these territories. The persons who will have to carry out this task must be given opportunity to hold themselves in readiness for it."

("Ein Programm für sozialen Ausgleich. Die Ziele des BHE: Lastenausgleich und Wiedergewinnung des deutschen Ostens", "Die Welt", No. 160, July 12th 1950.)

It is intended to make the resettlers willing cannon-fodder for the new German imperialism by the artificially preserved and increased misery in which they live and through "their" organisation, the BHE. They should serve as the spearhead of a new attack on the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

The existence of the resettlers thus forms an important excuse for the expansionist aims of German imperialism. If the resettlers did not exist they

would have to be invented. Their existence makes German imperialism an especially esteemed and valuable ally for American imperialism.

4. West Germany's role in relation to the peoples of Europe

The sharpening of the aggressive policy of US imperialism has increased all the contradictions in the imperialist camp. British and French imperialism follow with growing unwillingness the adventurous policy of American imperialism. That can be seen in the differing attitudes towards the Chinese People's Republic and by the lack of enthusiasm on the part of the British and French bourgeoisie for the American intervention in Korea. The clash between British and American interests in the battle for oil, particularily in the Middle East, has not lessened in the last few years but has actually greatly increased. The same is true in the question of the clash between French and American policies, as could be seen in the argument about control in North Africa and in a number of European questions.

American imperialism is, however, most worried about the attitude of the people of Western Europe who are exercising growing pressure on their governments. The peace movement in these countries, strongly and consistently led by the working class, is becoming more powerful and continuously drawing in new sections of the population. All attempts by the American imperialists to weaken the working class, particularily in France and Italy, have only resulted in the Communist Party emerging as the strongest party in the elections in both countries.

The growing imperialist contradictions and above all the increasing recognition by the masses of the people that it is necessary to defend peace by all means in their power make most West European countries very uncertain bases for American imperialism. Compared to the other countries West Germany appears to offer a stronger and more secure basis.

Here American imperialism finds a monopoly capital equal to it in its lust for attack and conquest, and which identifies itself with the expansionist aims of American imperialism instead of regarding them as being forced upon it. The German monopolistic bourgeoisie have great experience in oppressing other peoples, particularily in the terroristic enslavement of the working class and the brutal extirpation of the working class movement. The working class in West Germany has not yet taken the road to unity of action against the danger of war with such determination as have the workers in other West European countries. The West German workers are still more deeply split than in any other country by the policy of the Schumacher clique and the right-wing leadership of the DGB (German Trade Union Federation).

American imperialism, therefore, believes that it can most favourably make its European base in West Germany. It believes it can use the German monopolists as a means of pressure against the British and the French imperialists and above all as police against the European peoples.

The representatives of British and French imperialism have been driven by the Americans from all positions in which they had decisive influence on German

industry. Typical in this connection is the Combined Steel Control Group, the occupation authorities' body controlling West German steel production. Here American representatives have five of the twelve seats while the British have only four seats. 90 % of the steel industry is concentrated in the British zone and only about 5 % of the productive capacity of the West German steel industry is in the American zone.

As far back as the beginning of the Marshall Plan West German economy was favoured compared to those of Britain and France and this amounted to actual pressure on these two countries. Development was much quicker in the basic industries of West Germany, coal and steel production and export, than in France and Britain, and in the other branches of industry the speed of development was even greater.

The unequal speed of economic development in the different imperialist countries gave the German monopolists the chance to regain or even to surpass nearly all their pre-war positions, although in 1948 they were right down at the bottom of the list. At the moment West German economy is already exerting the same degree of pressure on the economies of Britain and France as the planned West German army would do in the military and political fields.

III

WEST GERMANY'S ECONOMIC POTENTIAL AND WAR ECONOMY

1. German and American monopoly capital interlock 57

Germany's indebtedness under GARIOA and the Marshall Plan 57 / Bonn's total indebtedness 58 / American share in West Germany 59

2. German imperialism is reborn 61

The punishment of war criminals prevented 61 / The salvation of German monopoly capital 62 / The "Hessen case" 64 / The "case of North-Rhine Westphalia" 64 / Reorganisation of the West German Trusts 64 / The power of the banks is unbroken 66 / Unrestricted government by financiers 66 / Participation in "opening up" Africa 68

3. The most dangerous warmongering trusts in West Germany 69

Krupp and Thyssen 70 / Klöckner, Mannesmann, Haniel and Hoesch 71 / The house of Stinnes 72

4. West German economy—a part of American war economy 74

Retention of war economy 74 / Growth of the armaments industry—throttling of peace industry 74 / Industries controlled by American capital in the lead 75 / The resurrection of "Wehrwirtschaft" 76 / Compulsory war economy is in course of construction 77 / Bonn's "Commissar for Raw Materials" / Foreign Trade in the service of remilitarisation 79 / Arms' imports 80 / The workers bear the brunt of rearmament 81

On September 19th 1950, the New York secret conference of the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and France, mentioned above, decided to remove the Allied regulations on the prohibited and limited branches of German industry with regard to West Germany. The communique of the conference stated:

> "The Foreign Ministers further agree to revise the agreement on prohibited and limited industries in view of the development in relation to the Federal Republic."

The agreement on prohibited and limited industries concluded on March 31st, 1946, was based on the Potsdam decisions and the main directives thereof:

> "Elimination of Germany's war potential and the industrial disarmament of Germany.
>
> Development of agriculture and peace industry."

The agreement, in accordance with these directives, put no limits on peace industry. The New York decision, however, imposed no security measures to prevent the reestablishment of German war industry. That was not its purpose, since it was intended to restore the armament industry of West Germany to the full extent. Simultaneously the New York conference decided upon the reestablishment of a West German army. The remilitarisation of West Germany which had been secretly prepared for a long time had clearly reached a new stage of development.

American imperialists are not only so strongly interested in the reestablishment of the West German war potential because they need German imperialism as an ally for their war plans, but also because they are closely connected with German monopoly capital and would like to earn money from German armaments as they do from American.

1. German and American monopoly capital interlock

The connection between German and American monopoly capital is not new. It can be traced back to the end of the last century when for instance the German "Edison Gesellschaft" which later became the AEG, acquired the American Edison patents and laid the foundations for its later close connection with the General Electric Co. It was General Electric too, with its fabulously high stock capital of 1,177 million dollars, part of the Morgan empire which reestablished the old links in a new form after the First World war. The so-called "Young Plan" was named after the President of General Electric, Owen D. Young, who also took a leading part in the drafting of the Dawes Plan and who was the first reparations agent of American finance capital in Germany during the Weimar Republic.

Germany's indebtedness under GARIOA and the Marshall Plan

In order to greatly extend and stabilise the ties created after the First World War and in order to bring West Germany firmly into the American plans, American imperialism invested great sums in West Germany after the Second World War too.

A large part came directly from the American Military Budget under the title of GARIOA (Government Appropriations for Relief in Occupied Areas). The name was intended to give the impression that it was a large-scale charitable grant. Actually, however, GARIOA credits must be paid back to the last cent. Another part of the American capital invested in Germany comes from the so-called Marshall Plan, the European Recovery Programme, the name of which has also been chosen to awaken the impression of generous American help. There is not a single word in any of these many American propaganda publications about the Marshall Plan in West Germany indicating that it is not a generous American "gift" but rather a credit all of which must be paid back. The "smart trick" about these credits is that the American creditor leaves the West German debtor in the dark as to when and under what conditions the money must be paid back.

The indebtedness of West Germany to American finance capital has grown since the Second World War through GARIOA and Marshall Plan by leaps and bounds and is already more than 15 thousand million marks. This indebtedness accumulated in six years is larger than the entire long-term indebtedness of the whole of Germany in 1931 after the great American loans had poured in. In July 1931 the long-term credits for the whole of Germany reached a total of 10.7 thousand million marks and were regarded at that time as dangerously high.

One must naturally add the debts contracted before the Second World War to the new debts in order to get a real idea of the influence of American finance capital in Germany and its close connection with the German finance capital, since these old debts have all been recognised by the Adenauer government.

Bonn's total indebtedness

The total foreign indebtedness of Germany in 1940, reckoned at the then ruling dollar rate of 1 dollar = 2.5 marks, amounted to 9.4 thousand million marks. At today's rate of exchange that would be about 15.8 thousand million marks without reckoning the accumulated compound interest. Even on the most modest estimates the total sum can be little less than 20 thousand million marks, of which between 10 and 15 thousand million are due to the United States. From a total foreign indebtedness of some 35 thousand million marks Bonn is thus indebted to the finance capitalists of the United States for between 27 and 30 thousand million marks. Ten thousand million of this total represent the debt of banks, industry and transport while the remaining sum of between 17 und 20 thousand million falls on the Bonn separatist government, the provinces and the municipalities.

The loans which produced the old indebtedness of Bonn were given to Germany after the First World War following the Dawes Conference on German reparations payments. At that time there was scarcely a single large enterprise in Germany which had not accepted an American loan. With the help of these loans the German monopolies were reorganised and German imperialism, which had been hard hit by the First World War, was regenerated. The credits for German heavy industry and particularly for the German steel trust "Vereinigte Stahlwerke AG" came almost exclusively from the Wall Street banking house of Dillon Read & Co. In the short period from October, 1924, to

December, 1928, this banking house invested more than 200 million dollars in German loans.

The influence of this banking house on occupation policy in West Germany after the Second World War can be seen from the fact that its President was Truman's Secretary of Defence, James V. Forrestal, who as is well known, fell victim to his own war hysteria. The Vice-President of Dillon Read & Co. is General William H. Draper jnr., former director of the Economic Department of the US Military Government in West Germany, who later became a deputy to the Secretary of Defence. He has now returned to his post of Vice-President in Wall Street. Another Vice-President of Dillon Read & Co., Paul Henry Nitze, worked during the war in important positions in the Secretary of State's Department and in 1946 took over the Department of International Trade Policy. He played a leading role in drafting the Marshall Plan and is still working in the Secretary of State's Department.

Through Germany's huge debt American finance capital has not only established close connections with the German monopolists but it has also made sure that its interests are properly protected by seeing to it that its representatives hold key positions in the administration and the occupation authorities of West Germany.

American share in West Germany

The interlocking of German and American financial capital is not confined to the relationship between debtor and creditor. The relationship also takes the much closer form of partnership, the relationship of business associates. American monopolists have a direct share in a great number of German enterprises. The total extent of this partnership, in so far as it can be proved at all, is much more than 1000 million marks. According to the "Deutsches Wirtschaftsinstitut" in Berlin which for the first time has investigated American participation in the German economy, the share amounts to about 1.4 thousand million marks. That is a very modest estimate and the actual influence of American capital may be regarded as about twice as high, thus including some 3000 million marks of West German stock capital.

The German enterprises concerned are naturally not minor ones and the American partners are not small or middle businessmen. On the contrary the leading finance capitalist groups in the United States have put their money into the most essential enterprises of the most important branches of industry in Germany.

First of all comes the West German oil industry in which American finance capital has a share amounting to 172 million marks. In this case the biggest American oil trust, Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, has the biggest interest. Standard Oil forms the most important part of the Rockefeller empire, the empire which also includes the Chase National Bank with its share capital of 4.6 thousand million dollars. The Chase National Bank has already extended credits amounting to about 600 million dollars in the framework of the Marshall Plan and that part of the Western German oil industry which is under American command has had its share of this money. Since Mr. John J. McCloy, American High Commissioner for West Germany, was formerly the lawyer for

the Chase National Bank, he may well have had a share in making the credits available for the construction of oil refineries needed for war, and for the opening up of new oil fields in West Germany.

Second place in respect to American participation is taken by the West German electro-technical industry. Here the American finance capitalists have concentrated above all on AEG and C. Lorenz AG with their dozens of subsidiary companies. American influence in this branch of industry amounts to about 142 million marks, of which the lion's share has been provided by the biggest group of American finance capital, the house of J. P. Morgan, which has provided capital through the General Electric and the International Telephone and Telegraph Companies. The house of Morgan also has a share in the Marshall Plan loan and here too McCloy is involved. His brother-in-law, John Sharman Zinsser, is a director of the banking house J. P. Morgan & Co. Another of his brothers-in-law- is Bonn's "Chancellor" Adenauer.

The motor industry comes third with American participation amounting to 128 million marks. Two great American trusts here share the influence. The "Adam Opel AG" is owned outright by the General Motors Corp., with a stock capital of 3 thousand million dollars, which belongs to the notorious Du Pont family. The Du Ponts got rich through many wars and today their main income is derived from the manufacture of atom and hydrogen bombs. The "Fordwerke AG" is a subsidiary of the Ford Motor Co. which with its capital of 1.15 thousand million dollars is the second largest motor maker in the capitalist world after General Motors. Opel and Ford together manufacture practically half of all the cars made in West Germany.

These are only a few examples which show how closely German and American finance capital interlock in the form of direct business partnership, and many more examples could be given. These further examples would only show that on both sides of the ocean the leading warmongers and their trusts have supreme control. Standard Oil, General Electric, Ford, Harriman and General Motors are the most important American warmongering trusts. Charles E. Wilson, director of General Electric Co., and the highest paid director in the USA, is responsible for the "Defence Mobilisation Department" of his country. His opposite number in West Germany, Bonn's "Commissar for Raw Materials", is Otto A. Friedrich, one of the most highly paid directors in West Germany, General Director of the Harburger Gummiwarenfabrik, Phoenix AG, which is closely connected with the American Firestone Tyre and Rubber Corporation for which Friedrich worked many years in the United States.

Apart from the personal relationships, as between Adenauer and McCloy, and the financial relationships as seen in the loans and partnerships, agreements of the most diverse kinds play an important part in the interlocking of German and American financial capital. They include international cartel arrangements, patent arrangements, etc. Such arrangements have existed and still exist between various German and American trusts. Best known is the agreement between IG Farben AG and the great Standard Oil trust of New Jersey. These connections were not even interrupted during the war and after the end of the war IG Farben reaped the benefit in so far as the representatives of American finance capital found a way successfully to frustrate the liquidation

of the IG Farben trust ordered by a Control Council law. All these things go to show how closely knit relations between German and American finance capital are.

2. German imperialism reborn

An official American publication reporting the proceedings of the Committee for Small Businesses of the House of Representatives stated:

> "Concentration is the direct antithesis of the system of free enterprise... Economic concentration leads inevitably to the disappearance of small enterprises and of competition, to price fixing, the limitation of production and the creation of unemployment ... It tries to control and limit technical experimentation and to withhold from workers and consumers the advantages of growing production. Finally the concentration of economic power becomes the concentration of political power with the result that small powerful groups of interests control the state political life of the nation." (United States v. Economic Concentration and Monopoly, 742,294, Washington 1947, p. 92.)

The application of this perfectly correct analysis to Germany had led two years earlier at the Potsdam Conference to the formulation of paragraph 12 of the part dealing with Germany which stated:

> „At the earliest practicable date, the German economy shall be decentralised for the purpose of eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular by cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements."

This decision arose from the realisation that the mighty concentration of economic power in Germany, particularly in the heavy industry, in the chemical industry, in the electro-technical industry and in banking was the basis of aggressive German imperialism and that it had created fascism and was the source of the lust for world power of German monopoly capital. In the former Soviet occupation zone, today the German Democratic Republic, this decision of the Potsdam Conference was carried out in the spirit and in the letter. It was not only put into practice as an Allied demand but also because it was a necessary part of any German programme for democratising the life of the German people and converting them into a really peaceful people. It was thus a really national task. The industrial war criminals were expropriated, and in so far as they had not fled to their Western protectors, received their just deserts.

The punishment of war criminals prevented

In West Germany the position was different. Practically nothing happened to the most dangerous war criminals. Here too there were a few progressive Americans who took the Potsdam Agreement seriously, but they met insuperable difficulties. Mr. Nixon told the Senate Committee:

> "We had a lot of difficulty arresting these people. We could not persuade the CIC to give us the people to carry out the arrests and instead we had to send our own people out to arrest. And then we had a lot of trouble. I mention this because it reflects the general atmosphere in which we had

to work. We could not get any cells for these people... For several days we had to hold them under house arrest while we were having a lot of difficulty getting cells for them." (Kilgore Committee, 74,241, p. 1950.)

It was thus almost impossible to arrest a war criminal in the American occupation zone in 1945. Once they were behind bars their friends in high places moved very quickly to help them. Colonel Bernstein told the same Senate Commission:

> "One day representatives of the IG Farben Control Officer came to us and asked us if we could release some of the leading IG Farben people from jail or prepare their release ... so that these IG Farben people could be employed at very high salaries to continue the work of the IG Farben factories.
>
> We were also asked whether we could find a method by which the salaries to be paid to these IG Farben officials would not be blocked in accordance with General Eisenhower's order blocking the property of certain categories of people belonging to this group." (Kilgore Committee, p. 1,108.)

Under the pressure of public opinion, particularily in the countries which had suffered under fascist occupation, some of these industrial war criminals finally had to be arrested. Three of the firms accused of war crimes, Krupp, Flick and IG Farben faced trials at Nuremberg. One of the main accused in the IG Farben trial, Georg von Schnitzler, made a statement on September 11th, 1945, which showed the atmosphere prevailing between the accused and their "prosecutors" in the so-called war criminal prisons. He said:

> "The personal relationship between the investigating official and myself in Frankfurt during 1945 was very free and easy, it was most cordial." (Office of Chief Counsel for war crime, document No. NI 5,191, p. 1.)

The "punishment" of the leading industrial war criminals was what might be expected from such "cordial relationship". They are today free again. Alfried Krupp was the last one to be released in February 1951, and his entire property as cannon king of Essen was restored to him. The release of Krupp and his directors marked the end of an episode of the Anglo-American occupation policy in West Germany which consisted in throwing sand into the eyes of their own peoples and the German people by making a show of attacking aggressive German imperialism.

The salvation of German monopoly capital

The Krupps and the Flicks and the Schnitzlers were needed for the new stage of American policy in West Germany—open rearmament—just as their trusts were needed. Words which the Chief American Prosecutor spoke at the Nuremberg trial in 1947 could be seen in 1951 to be prophetic. Many thousands of German and international democrats and friends of peace had voiced the same opinion. The American Prosecutor said:

> "If the guilt of these accused is brought to light and if they are not duly sentenced they will represent a greater danger to the future peace of the world than Hitler was in his time."

Today this danger has become incontrovertible fact.

The action to save the West German concerns and trusts started as long ago as December 22nd, 1945, when Law 52 was issued in the Western zones. This law placed 67 anthracite and lignite companies "under control" without however, interfering with the property rights of the pitowners. On the basis of this law general order No. 7 was issued on July 20th, 1946, which ordered the control of the iron and steel industry. In October 1946 the "Treuhandverwaltung" (trustee) was established as the "German organ" of the North German Iron and Steel Control, charged with "decartellising the steel industry". Some time later the German Coal Mining Management was set up. It was almost possible to believe the British declaration that the Western powers were about to take the Potsdam Decisions seriously. As late as August 1st, 1947, the London "Times" commented:

> "On the Ruhr there is no choice between private and public ownership; the private owners on the Ruhr are Thyssen, Stinnes and other big industrialists who lent their riches and their influence to the support of Hitler. If the Ruhr workers believed that their old bosses were coming back no conceivable inducement could make them produce more."

On closer inspection however, this "decartellisation" proved to be an empty bluff. Herr Heinrich Dinkelbach, for many years financial director of the Vereinigten Stahlwerke AG, the decisive trust of German heavy industry, was appointed to head the trustees for the iron and steel industry. He was the natural "trustee" for the Ruhr trusts but could never be trustee for the German people. General Director Heinrich Kost was appointed to head the German Coal Mining Management, a post which he still holds. Kost is Chairman of the Mine Owners' Federation, a member of Rheinisch-Westphälisches Kohlensyndikat and director of half a dozen leading enterprises, a worthy representative of German finance capital. The British Military Governor, General Sir Brian Robertson, himself a big industrialist and director of Dunlops, told the Parliament of North Rhine Westphalia on April 7th, 1948:

> "I can repeat the promise which has been given to you in the past that the British government will never allow German industry to return to its former owners."

With these words he appealed hypocritically to the working people of West Germany who expected the war criminal trusts to be confiscated. At the same time Herr Heinrich Dinkelbach, with his eye on German big business, spoke much more clearly and openly when he stated at the same time over the North West German Radio:

> "If I was lucky enough to hold some shares, let us say in the Klöckner concern or Vereinigten Stahlwerke I would not have to feel victimised because I could then be sure of proper compensation in some form or other in the course of time."

The British big businessman in the uniform of a general broke his word but the German big businessman kept his.

In those cases in which the German population believed the promises of the Western occupation powers about the economic dispossession of the reactionary big industrialists, bankers, etc., and when they attempted to act on these promises the Western occupation powers intervened to protect their friends, the German imperialists, the monopolists, bankers and junkers.

The "Hessen case"

In 1946 the Parliament of the Province of Hessen worked out a draft Constitution which was submitted to the electorate for approval. This draft constitution stated in Article 41:

> "When this Constitution becomes effective:
> (1) Coal, lime and ore mines, iron and steel works, power stations and railway and trolleybus lines shall become public property.
> (2) Big banks and insurance companies together with enterprises named in paragraph one the headquarters of which are situated outside the Province of Hessen will be subjected to state administration or control."

The American occupation power which had made it its business to protect the German monopolists and bankers protested against this article 41 of the Hessian Constitution and forbade its inclusion in the Constitution. The Hessian government, under the pressure of public opinion, remained firm and based its stand on the many declarations made by the Americans about the right of the Germans to have "democracy and self-determination". General Clay then insisted that article 41 be the subject of a special plebiscite. The plebiscite was held with a result which General Clay had not expected; 70 % of the electorate voted in favour of article 41 of the Constitution. The democratic wishes of the overwhelming majority of the population could not have been expressed more clearly.

The American occupation authorities, however, breaking all democratic principles, continued to prevent this article of the Constitution being put into force.

Some years later the reactionary parties won a majority in the Hessian Parliament.

The "case of North-Rhine Westphalia"

In North-Rhine Westphalia too, the industrial heart of Germany, the Western powers saw to it that every attempt to carry out the Potsdam decisions on the democratisation of Germany was stifled at birth. On October 22nd 1946, Bevin had declared in the House of Commons that it had been decided to nationalise the heavy industry of the Ruhr. The coal and steel industry would be "socialised" first, followed by the chemical and engineering industries.

When, however, the electors of North-Rhine Westphalia voted for the nationalisation of heavy industry and the expropriation of the reactionary big industrialists, and when the Parliament on August 6th 1948 passed a law to this effect the British Military Government vetoed this law on the request of the American government.

The Western occupation powers thus saw to it that the nazi and war criminals, the most reactionary forces in Germany, the Ruhr magnates and the junkers with their entourage of nazi bosses and former generals in West Germany were not dispossessed.

Reorganisation of the West German Trusts

The forms of organisation of the most important big German enterprises had proved obsolete in the eyes of the monopolists. In the course of twelve years

of war and fascism they had absorbed an enormous quantity without being able to digest it, and had become top-heavy. This was particularily true of the steel trusts and the chemical trusts. Even during the fascist war of conquest plans had been considered in both monopolies for a certain decentralisation, since the enormous ramifications of both monopolies could no longer be observed and led from one central control point. Camouflaged as "decartellisation of the trusts on the basis of the Potsdam decisions" this necessary reorganisation was carried out after the war.

Mr. Nixon told the Kilgore Committee:

> "... The IG Farben control followed the line which was recommended before the end of the war by officials of IG Farben themselves as the best way to adapt to the facts of defeat and occupation. These decisions were based partly on a letter from Max Ilgner, one of the leading people with IG Farben, which he wrote from prison in May 1945 to two of his colleagues in the central financial department of IG Farben. He instructed them to remain in the closest possible contact with each other and with other leaders of IG Farben. He prophesied that the American authorities would finally allow IG Farben to start working again and emphasised the importance of keeping the organisation alive until this time came." (Kilgore Committee, p. 1,563.)

The coal-mining syndicates and particularly the "Rheinisch-Westfälisches Kohlensyndikat" were dissolved. Their staffs were used, however, to build up the German Coal Mining Management and its subsidiaries (German Coal Sales Department, the Mining Supplies Department, etc.), which had even greater powers than the syndicates had had. In the iron and steel industry the foundries were "separated' from the trusts although the trusts remained the owners of the means of production and formed a horizontal monopoly. The IG Farben was provisionally divided up into separate works units administered by trustees but the property rights were left untouched. Everything developed as the German and American monopolists had planned. Other trusts and monopolistic arrangements were left absolutely untouched by the "decartellisation".

With the beginning of open rearmament new steps were taken in the "decartellised' trusts and businesses. In heavy industry vertical trusts made their comeback. The "Vereinigte Stahlwerke", which formerly consisted of 14 companies, was now reorganised into only twelve "works units". The only difference was that these twelve companies were in name "independent" like the individual companies of the American steel trust or of Standard Oil which have also been "decartellised". The other heavy industrial trusts like Klöckner, Mannesmann, Hösch, and "Gute Hoffnung" foundry remained almost unchanged. Eight of these new "works units" have been allotted direct ownership of pits and coke plants. Five of these are companies of the steel trust, the position of which in West German industry has been still further strengthened by the new arrangement.

In the chemical industry the factories of the IG Farben Trust have been reorganised in five great groups according to what they produce or to their geographical position. In a number of branches of chemical production the monopoly of the trust has been left completely untouched, as in the cases of Buna, plastics, softeners and many other products.

Contrary to the Potsdam decisions the decisive powerful organisations in the economy of West Germany were thus not removed. Under the protection of the Western occupation powers they were able to reorganise according to their own plans and considerably increase their strength.

The power of the banks is unbroken

What is true for industry is true for the banks too. The "big three", the leading banks (Deutsche Bank, Dresdner Bank, Commerz- und Privatbank) had made themselves guilty of war crimes by their active financial support of fascist armament and war. Like industry they had earned enormous sums from armaments and war. Their dissolution and the transfer of their property to the people should have been a matter of course. That is exactly what happened to them in the then Soviet zone of Germany.

Not in West Germany however. Officially the big banks were suspended but they were actually taken over by "regional banks" which were nothing else than the former provincial branches of the great banks. This was expressed publicly by the fact that all these banks still quoted in brackets after their titles the title of their old mother bank. Basically what had happened to industry happened to the banks. Their form of organisation, which had become clumsy in its rapid growth and could no longer deal efficiently with the necessary problems, was reorganised. For the tasks now set before the West German banks of financing rearmament they have been recentralised again in a small number of groups with divided and carefully defined responsibilities.

An new and important bank has been founded in addition to the old monopolistic banks which, as has been seen, continued to exist in a somewhat modified form. This new bank is the "Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau" which has a special sort of monopoly. It is the distribution centre for all American credits, handled only by it. With this function the "Wiederaufbaubank" is not only a monopoly itself but is also in a position to control the whole of the economic life in West Germany effectively by the way in which it directs credits. It is the German bank directly responsible for carrying out the commissions of American finance capital. American finance capital has never in the past held such a firm position in German banking as it does with the "Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau". For this reason the bank is headed by the most reliable man whom American finance capital could find in West Germany, Hermann J. Abs, who also gave his devoted services to fascist armament. At the age of 36 in 1937 he was not only Chairman of the board of the Deutsche Bank, the greatest banking trust in Germany, but he was also on the board of dozens of enterprises as leading representative of German finance capital. His leading role in banking and industry simultaneously marks Abs as the typical finance capitalist, of the kind who can be found in all key positions of German industry: on the board of directors of IG Farben, the Glanzstoff Konzern, the Deutsche Solvay Werke. He is today, once again, the most powerful man on German finance capital and in this capacity he represented the interests of the German monopolists at the London Conference on West German debts.

Unrestricted government by financiers

In other spheres too West German monopoly capital is making efforts to restore its old positions, in order to start the planned new war from the most

favourable bases. The number of enterprises is being steadily decreased, both through fusion and because of the bankruptcies and consequent closing of small and middle sized businesses. The natural result is that the big businesses are becoming stronger. The system of cartels which broke down when the economy as a whole broke down has been restored. Even the Social Democrat Professor Nölting, one of the "saviours of capitalism" was forced to declare last year that German economy "was enmeshed in a spider's web of irregular price agreements and that illegal cartels are shooting up at an enormous speed". The "Frankfurter Rundschau" complained on March 8th 1950:

> "Very serious boycott threats have been made against firms which will not take part in such illegal price arrangements or which do not want to subordinate themselves to a business-group."

Employers' associations have been reestablished, headed by the Federal Association of Industry, which corresponds to the former "Reichsverband" and which already has a stronger influence on economic developments than the Reichsverband ever had.

All the "traditional" positions of German financial capital have been restored although their former territory is, of course, reduced by one third. The "traditional" leaders of monopoly capital are back at their posts again. All of them, or nearly all of them, used to have their names on the list of war criminals at a time when decent and progressive Americans believed that the United States too, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, would play an honourable part in destroying German imperialism. These decent Americans could not guess that Truman would ignominiously betray Roosevelt's heritage. Practically all those whose names stood on the list of German industrial war criminals prepared by the Kilgore Committee are today back in office again. It can be truthfully said that there is no trust or big business in West Germany today without its own war criminal or war economy expert.

One of those whose name stood beside that of Abs on a war criminals' list and who works closely with him today is Dr. Robert Pferdmenges, owner of the Cologne banking house of the same name, a name which it adopted only in the year 1938. Previously this banking house had been called Sal. Oppenheim & Cie. and Herr Pferdmenges "aryanised" it in the course of Hitler's persecution of the Jews. Pferdmenges was one of the directors of the Disconto Bank and is today described as "the richest man in West Germany". He has a seat on innumerable boards of directors, he is the financial adviser to Chancellor Adenauer as he formerly was to Chancellor Brüning and is persona grata with the Vatican. He is on very friendly terms not only with Adenauer but also with Victor Agartz, Social Democrat and member of the Committee of the German Trade Union Federation (DGB). Agartz was former head of the bi-zonal economic department and is today head of the Trade Union Institute for Economics. It should be mentioned that Agartz is also on very good terms with Abs. The monopoly capitalists have always understood how to secure their positions on the right wing of the working class movement.

Abs and Pferdmenges have been quoted as the two most outstanding representatives of finance capital. Together with about twenty other persons of the same type they form the German "finance oligarchy" which today completely controls West Germany.

Two examples can be given of the intimate manner in which this financial oligarchy is interwoven with the government. The first example is the Chancellor himself. Adenauer is a typical representative of German finance capital. His family relationship to American finance capital, to one of the leading Morgan directors, has already been mentioned. He was, for many years, a director of the Deutsche Bank from which Herr Abs also comes. Unlucky speculations in the shares of "Vereinigte Glanzstoffwerke" which he carried out with bank funds nearly sent him to prison once, but that is more than 20 years ago. The owners of the Glanzstoffwerke, whom he had helped in his capacity as President of the Prussian Council of State, by authorising special import duties for artificial silk, returned the kindness by making him a present of 1 million marks worth of stock. On his 70th birthday Herr Pferdmenges presented him with 1 million marks in the name of West German industry for "social publicity purposes". The money came from the same people who only ten years ago used to present the bloody-handed leader of the SS, Himmler, with a million marks every year from "a circle of friends". Adenauer has strengthened his ties to finance capital by the recent marriage of his daughter to the son of the big businessman Werhahn.

The second example is Dr. Robert Lehr, the present Minister of the Interior in Bonn. Before 1933 Lehr was for a long period Lord Mayor of Dusseldorf, as trusted representative of the West German Montan industry. When Hitler in 1932 made his notorious speech in the Dusseldorf industrialists' club Lehr was among the audience and was one of those introduced to Hitler. In 1947 he made the following statement about the meeting:

> "As Lord Mayor I was a member of the industrialists' club and accepted the invitation to the evening meeting at which Hitler gave his lecture. At the and of the lecture Herr Florian, who later became Gauleiter, arranged that I be introduced to Hitler."

Until he took over his present office Lehr had a seat on a number of boards of directors, particularily that of the "Vereinigte Stahlwerke AG" of which he is now the direct representative in the government.

These two examples show the way in which finance capital controls the government apparatus in West Germany. They confirm the American opinion quoted at the beginning of this chapter that the concentration of economic power leads to the concentration of political power. In West Germany today a "small powerful group of interests control the state and the political life of the nation" and attempt to direct it ever more strongly along the path of remilitarisation and war.

Participation in "opening up" Africa

The German monopolists are continually attempting to restore the "world importance" of German imperialism which includes, of course, the chance of exploiting foreign nations. They focus their efforts on participation in the so-called "Point Four Programme" of the American President, the programme for "opening up undeveloped areas".

The American imperialists are at present intensively occupied in "opening up" the African continent and converting it into a great armaments base and military

base, in seizing its sources of raw materials and taking control over the population of 160 million. German imperialism wants to take part in this imperialist programme for the increasing enslavement of the African colonial population. On February 22nd 1951, the Dusseldorf "Handelsblatt" produced an African special number which openly announced the claims of the German monopolists. The Chairman of the "Afrika-Verein Hamburg-Bremen" wrote in this number:

> "It must be our endeavour to participate in every way, both scientifically and economically in these tasks in Africa."

Franz Blücher, the Marshall Plan Minister in Bonn, wrote in the same newspaper that Germany was being given a chance to invest capital in Africa "to the economic advantage of both Africa and Europe". Reports on investments which have already taken place show that this has already happened to a considerable degree.

> The DKW-factory has set up a branch in the Union of South Africa which produces and assembles DKW vehicles.
>
> "Henschel & Sohn", Kassel have formed an African subsidiary, named "Henschel & Ash Locomotive Co., Ltd." in Johannesburg. The company has started a big factory near Johannesburg for the building of vehicles and boilers.
>
> The "Heinckel" Aircraft Works, together with the "Mercantile Acceptance Corporation of South Africa" has made preparations to build a factory to produce cars, tractors, motorcycles and planes.
>
> The "Ruhrchemie AG", the "Lurgis AG", and the "Gesellschaft für Lindes Eismaschinen" are engaged in building a huge Fischer Tropsch plant for the hydrogenation of coal in South Africa.
>
> The "Volkswagen" factory at Wolfsburg have built an assembly plant at Port Elizabeth which is already in production and which is to be expanded.
>
> Many other big businesses in West Germany plan to set up factories in Africa. The profits which the West German trusts and businesses are squeezing out of their workers are already so large that they can devote these profits to supplementary armaments projects in foreign countries and take part in the exploitation of the colonial peoples for their war preparations, as in the case of Africa.

All this shows clearly that aggressive German imperialism has been reestablished. The peoples of the world made untold sacrifices to stamp out the most dangerous breeding ground of war and to destroy German imperialism. The German monopolists demanded untold sacrifices from the German people too in order to satisfy their boundless lust for conquest. The Potsdam decisions gave the world and the German people hope that the aggressive forces in Germany would be destroyed and peace made secure. American imperialism has betrayed these hopes, torn up the Potsdam decisions and given German imperialism a new lease of life

3. The most dangerous warmongering trusts in West Germany

The previous chapter has sketched the revival of aggressive German imperialism and described it as a result of the concentration of economic power. This concentration of economic power appears in the form of great monopolistic

organisations, cartels, syndicates and trusts, which control the economic life of the country. These monopolistic organisations are anonymous, however. The "Vereinigten Stahlwerke AG", the "IG Farben Industrie AG" are impersonal concentrations of capital which only serve to conceal the personal power of a very small group of finance capitalists whose personal pockets they fill.

The joint stock company is sometimes described as a democratic institution. Every share has one vote and the majority decides, as in every democracy. All big joint stock companies claim that the majority of their shares are held in small packets by old-age pensioners and small investors and thus it is impossible for single people to control the company.

It is absolutely true that in the case of some big joint stock companies a great part of the shares are held by many small investors, and this is entirely in accordance with the wishes of the big shareholders who have the decisive voice. The more divided the shareholding is, the "cheaper" the control of the company. If you want to control a company in which the shareholding is concentrating you must hold at least 51 % of the shares. However, if the shares are split up into innumerable small packets then the control of the company is possible with a 40, 30 or even 20 % holding. It is always difficult if not impossible to get the great number of small holders together for a general meeting, not to mention the difficulty of getting them to agree to a common course of action. "Democracy" in a joint stock company is of the sort where not the majority decides but he who has the most money. The finance capitalists use this device to hide behind the "democratic" facade of the joint stock company and thus conceal themselves from the eyes of the people. If you look behind the facade and investigate who is actually running the joint stock companies you will find that a comparatively small group of people turn up again and again in all most important enterprises. This small group—about 40 or 50 strong in West Germany—form the "finance oligarchy", the group of families which control the entire economic and political life of West Germany.

Krupp and Thyssen

The traditional conglomeration of these families of finance capitalists is found in the Ruhr area, in heavy industry, the banks and the chemical industry. For many decades they have built up and strengthened their power and converted their trusts and monopolies into real states within the state.

First of all there is the Krupp family, the prototype of a finance capitalist family. Alfried Krupp von Bohlen and Halbach was prematurely released from his mild form of imprisonment as a war criminal, restored in all his property rights and stands again today at the head of the family business. The name Krupp has officially disappeared but the property of Krupps in the Ruhr has been newly consolidated. The interests of Krupps in heavy industry have been combined with the Rossenray Mines of Krupps into a single company called "Hüttenwerk Rheinhausen AG." With their yearly output of 1,8 million tons of raw steel Krupps represent quite a considerable factor in German heavy industry. They played an important part in the preparation and leadership of German imperialism's two wars and the American monopolists want to allow them to take part in the preparation for the Third World War.

The Thyssens play a particularly important role in West Germany although they know well how to conceal their operations behind a veil of mystery. The

late Fritz Thyssen, second in the dynasty, who played a fateful role in Germany during the First World War and in the years between the two wars, wrote a book entitled "I paid Hitler". After 1923 German fascism owed its strength above all to his financial support. Fritz Thyssen was the creator of the German Steel Trust, in which he had an interest amounting to 26 %. His daughter and heir, Countess Anita Zichy-Thyssen, lives in Buenos Aires and has changed her nationality once again, abandoning the Hungarian passport gained by marriage and taking up the Argentinian. The Thyssens were always very broad-minded about their nationality. Fritz's brother, Baron Heinrich Thyssen-Bornemisza, also a "Hungarian" with big mining interests in the Ruhr, (among others the Walsum and Langenbrahm mines) used to live mainly in the Hague. Thyssen's immediate representative in West Germany is Dr. Wilhelm Roelen, who has a great deal of say in all negotiations on heavy industry. When he, however, attempted to become chief of the German Coal Mining Management a few years ago the workers of West Germany frustrated the plans of this typical war economy expert. General Director Kost who was named in his place, is, however, no better than he.

The Thyssen properties, which have been reorganised in twelve factory groups, are still the most important group in West German heavy industry. They control probably not less than half of the West German raw steel capacity. The fact that five of these twelve factory groups are connected with pits and coke works gives them a particularly important place in West German industry.

Klöckner, Mannesmann, Haniel and Hoesch

The Klöckner factories form a powerful group in heavy industry. Their interests are today mainly represented by Dr. Günter Henle, related by marriage to the Klöckner family. He looks after the family interests in the West German parliament too, where he has a seat as member of the Christian Democratic Union. Old Florian Klöckner made enormous profits in the First World War, largely by transporting many machines from France and Belgium to Germany. For instance he had the entire machinery of the Auboué foundry in the Briey district transferred to his Kneuttinger foundry. This unscrupulous monopolistic pirate recognised no limits where profits were concerned. During the First World War for instance he purchased ingot iron from the state works in Spandau for 250 marks a ton and then resold it to another department of the same works for 490 marks a ton.

The Klöckner properties, based on the huge frauds and colossal profits of two world wars, have been combined in one single mother company which is nearly as important as the Krupp properties. Connections with the Ickern and Victor pits and the three coke works belonging to them give the new Klöckner company an important position. When Günter Henle had himself appointed as Steel Trustee he knew very well what he was doing, and this post has been very profitable to the family. Herr Pferdemenges is a close business friend of the family and the Klöckners themselves have always been in close connection with the Deutsche Bank and Herr Abs.

The Mannesmanns too are an old family of war criminals. Long before the First World War their interests in Moroccan iron ore brought Germany to the brink of war, and were the reason for the infamous provocation staged by German imperialism when it sent the cannon boat "Panther" to Agadir.

They always played a part in financing the most extreme right-wing chauvinist element in Germany, the "Alldeutsche Verband" and it was therefore not surprising that Wilhelm Zangen, General Director of the Mannesmann firm, was appointed by Hitler as Chairman of his Armaments Council and leader of the "Reichsgruppe Industrie". As Chairman of the Armaments Council he saw to it that his trust got the most profitable armaments commissions.

The Mannesmann property has also remained completely untouched by the so-called decartellisation. They are thus in a position to plan and prepare new war crimes.

The Haniel family controls not only the "Gute Hoffnung" foundry, one of the most important West German heavy industrial works, but is also connected with the great electrical trusts Siemens and AEG. The most important representative of the Haniel interests is Herrmann Reusch, one of the leading West German armaments industrialists. One of the war criminals from the Flick Trust, Gerhard Bruns, went from Central Germany to the "Gute Hoffnung" foundry after the Second World War and has built it up to one of the decisive armaments works of West Germany. The "Gute Hoffnung" foundry has remained one single company after the decartellisation. It is one of the heavy industrial works which has already exceeded its pre-war production. This gives an indication of its importance in the armament of West Germany which is at present being prepared.

The Hoesch Trust is another trust which according to the Potsdam decisions should have been broken up because it represented an undue concentration of economic power. Three families of finance capitalists, Hoesch, Werhahn and von Waldthausen, who have close connection with innumerable other enterprises, control this trust. They are closely connected with Krupp, the "Rheinische Stahlwerke", the "Deutsche Erdöl AG", the "Wintershall AG", the "IG Farben AG", and many others. The Hoesch trust is just as much responsible for war crimes as all the other heavy industrial trusts, but its property and its might have been affected in no way by "decartellisation".

The house of Stinnes

It would be a great mistake to omit the house of Stinnes from any list of the leading families of the Ruhr. Hugo Stinnes, snr., stated in 1911:

> "If we have three or four years more of peaceful development Germany will be the undisputed economic ruler of Europe. Three or four years of peace and I guarantee German hegemony in Europe."

The Stinnes properties were a small empire even before the First World War and in the course of that war the family made enormous sums from the misery of the peoples of Europe. The "Jahrbuch für den Oberbergamtsbezirk Dortmund" for 1923 states:

> "In 1914 Hugo Stinnes' property was estimated to amount to 100 million gold marks, a sum which he was able to multiply during the war, like all big industrialists. His present property can scarcely be estimated ... but amounts without doubt to thousands of millions of gold marks and if expressed in terms of present day German currency would produce a figure otherwise only used by astronomers ... Posterity will perhaps one

> day learn the truth about the birth and growth of a power which exceeds all comparable fortunes—Morgan, Rothschild, Cecil Rhodes, Harriman, Carnegie, Rockefeller, Vanderbilt—and which has already today given rise to a sort of Stinnes Myth."

The writer of this hymn of praise was certainly himself a victim of this Stinnes myth and exaggerated greatly in the last part of his article. It is true, however, that Stinnes, with the help of his profits from the First World War, built up the greatest German trust which has ever been known. It is true that this trust burst like a soap bubble after his death, but enough remained to make the Stinnes family one of the richest in Germany. The West German mining property of the Stinnes family is very considerable and they have considerable holdings in other enterprises. The family has used the great capital investments which Stinnes senior made in foreign countries in order to Americanise itself and thus feel at home both in the United States and in Germany. Thus in the Second World War they made a lot of money both in the United States and in Germany. They also profited from the fact that their entire property in West Germany was treated after the end of the war as American property and thus free from all controls. The Stinnes family has great experience in cooperation with occupation powers. On October 5th, 1923, the leading industrialists, Stinnes, Klöckner, Velsen and Vögler, had a meeting with the French General Degoutte, who had marched into the Ruhr with his troops in breach of all treaty obligations. The industrialists made the following declaration to the French General:

> "Industry is convinced that it was a serious mistake to submit to Socialist influence and introduce a shorter working day after a lost war. Many difficulties could have been avoided if more coal had been produced and it must be our task to produce enough coal in order to supply France, Belgium, Holland and Switzerland in addition to Germany. The Rhine-Westphalian mining industry has, therefore, decided to introduce the pre-war working day from next Monday, i.e. eight and a half hours including winding time for underground workers and ten hours for surface workers. Industry will, however, not be in a position to carry out its intentions without the aid of the occupation powers."

The house of Stinnes thus has great experience in making business on both sides during a war, in increasing exploitation of the workers (the Stinnes works council was forced in June 1920 to sign an agreement that wage questions would be settled without reference to the normal wage scale and without consultation with trade union representatives), and also in working on a friendly basis with occupation powers against their own people, against the workers, in the interests of their profits and for the quicker preparation of a new war.

The imperialist families described here are a few choice specimens from the two or three dozen families named Mallinckrodt, von Stein, Siemens, Oppenheim, Schröder and Werhahn and so on. Every day they and their representatives in Bonn betray the true national interests of the German people. They control and poison the entire economic and political life of West Germany and they have made common cause with American finance capital in a plot to plunge the German people into a third world war still more terrible than those which have gone before, a world war which would mean the end of the German people.

4. West German economy—a part of American war economy

After 1933 fascist rearmament directed German economy entirely into the channels of war economy. Only those branches of the economy which served war were encouraged and helped in their development. All branches of peace industry were hampered by investment bans, withdrawal of raw material, refusal of man-power and credits as well as by shut-downs. They were thus stopped from developing and not even able to use their existing capacity. The consumer goods industry lagged far behind war industry. After the end of the war it would thus have been necessary to carry out a basic change of structure in the German economy which would produce a decisive trend towards peace industry. This was all the more necessary since the population of West Germany had increased by about 20 % since before the war.

Retention of war economy

What actually happened? This can be shown by a quotation from the investigation carried out by the Kilgore Committee in Washington:

> "Mr. Nixon: He (Mr. Dodge, director of the Finance Department of American Military Government, ed.) had certain difficulties with General Draper, director of the Economic Department, about some IG Farben factories ... particularily the poison gas factory down in Gendorf which he (Dodge) had insisted should be cleared for reparations and destruction, and that production should be suspended. General Draper on the other hand insisted that it was necessary to continue production in the Gendorf factory at least for a while.
>
> Chairman: What kind of production was going on there?
>
> Mr. Nixon: They were turning out anti-freeze liquid. During the war they turned out this anti-freeze as a by-product of the mustard gas which was made there and General Draper wanted this factory to go on working making anti-freeze.
>
> Chairman: Was it necessary for them to make mustard gas too?
> Mr. Nixon: No, although the apparatus for doing it was there.
> Chairman: They could have reconverted to mustard gas overnight?
> Mr. Nixon: Yes sir. The basic equipment remained unchanged." (Kilgore Committee, p. 1560/1561.)

As if the German people in 1945 had any urgent need of anti-freeze liquid! This passage shows quite clearly that American warmongers like Draper wanted to preserve the sections of German industry necessary for war in a form as unchanged as possible in order to be able to use them in a war against the Soviet Union. There has been no change in the situation since. The "Anorgana" factory in Gendorf is still today in a position to turn out poison gas. The structure of the West German economy has not been changed, on the contrary its warlike character initiated by the nazis has been further strengthened and extended.

Growth of the armaments industry—throttling of peace industry

The entire industrial production of West Germany in 1950 exceeded the 1936 figures by 9.5 %. In view of the growth in population the production per head was still below the pre-war figure and was only reached in the first five months

of 1951. However the development in the various branches of industry differed completely. In some branches production greatly exceeded the pre-war level and in other branches it was still well below this level.

Oil production for instance was 152 % higher in 1950 than in 1936 and in the first five months of 1951 rose to 183 % above the 1936 figure. In 1950 vehicle construction exceeded the 1936 figure by 54 % and in the first five months of 1951 by 92 %. Engineering averaged 121 % of the 1936 figures in 1950 and rose in the first five months of 1951 to 150 %. The electro-technical industry was producing 236 % of its 1936 production in 1950 and in the first five months of 1951 had reached 315 %.

The position with regard to consumer goods is quite different. In 1950 leather production was 27 % below pre-war and in the first five months of 1951 was still 24 % below. Shoe production in 1950 was 22 % below pre-war and in 1951 9 % below. In the first five months of 1951 the food industry actually declined by 2 % compared to the 1950 average. The building industry is below the pre-war figures.

There is thus a great difference in the development of industry which in some branches has greatly exceeded the pre-war figures while in others it is still below. This differentiation can also be seen in the individual branches of industry where certain commodities are being pushed ahead while others are lagging behind. In engineering, for instance, the production of machine tools, which are very important for war industry, which amounted in monthly average in 1936 in West Germany to about 9,000 tons had increased in May 1951 to nearly 10,000 tons. The production of agricultural machinery and equipment, however, which serves the peace economy, had declined from 19,000 tons in 1936 to 16,300 tons in May 1951. In vehicle production the production of private cars in May 1951 was 50 % above the 1936 figure but the production of lorries was 120 % higher. In the chemical industry the production of chemicals necessary for war like chlorine had increased by 160 % compared to 1936 and caustic soda by 200 % while for instance the production of soap and soap powder had declined from 42,600 tons to 18,900 tons.

These figures show that West German economy, far from becoming more normal, has been changed further on the road to war economy. Again the branches of the economy important for rearmament are being developed more quickly while peace industry is being throttled.

Industries controlled by American capital in the lead

It is important to note another fact. Certain branches of the war industry are receiving particular help today in West Germany, for instance engineering, the oil industry, the vehicle industry and the electrical industry. There are two reasons for this.

First of all they are industries which help to prepare the switch-over of the entire industry to war economy. They are the industries which produce machine tools and means of transport, reserves of raw materials like oil, and which at the same time prepare for the formation of the West German mercenary army by producing general army supplies such as uniforms, vehicles, radios, etc., and build barracks and fortifications. In this connection the rapidly increasing production of cement should be noted. The first reason is thus that West German

industry is at present still in the process of change-over, preparing for armaments production all along the line.

The second reason is that these industries are mainly those in which American finance capital is most strongly interested. Five West German branches of industry have exceeded their 1936 production in 1950 by more than 50 %.

They were (1936 = 100):

Artificial textiles	266
Electrical industry	236
Oil	252
Power	173
Vehicle production	154

The artificial textile industry is to a very considerable extent in the hands of non-German monopolists. American finance capital has a great interest in IG Farben, and the "Vereinigte Glanzstoffwerke" is owned by the Dutch AKU Trust. Here parachute silk and textiles for uniforms and equipment are made. Among the West German industries under American control the oil industry takes first place and the electrical industry second place. American capital has a great interest in power production, particularily in the form of loans, and vehicle production takes third place among the industries of West Germany controlled by the Americans. American finance capital, which is making enormous profits on armaments in the United States, naturally wants to make money from West German armament. The American interests want to have an advance on the staggering profits they can see coming when rearmament really gets under way. That is the second reason why certain branches of industry have been the first to be drawn to such an extent into the rearmament measures of revived German imperialism.

It must finally be noted that the German and American imperialists have been forced to proceed carefully in their policy of rearming West Germany. In this they come up against the resistance of all those peoples who themselves experienced imperialist German aggression; they come up against the ever growing resistance of the world peace movement and they come up against the increasing resistance of the German workers, who are less and less ready to forge the weapons for criminal German imperialism and to act as willing tools for it. That is why the Bonn armament politicians try to camouflage and hide their measures of rearmament and prepare everything for the day when they are able to switch over to arms production in full force.

The resurrection of "Wehrwirtschaft"

The armament programme of newly established German imperialism needs a "theory" just as fascist rearmament had its theory of "Wehrwirtschaft" (war economy) and its war economy compulsion measures. The war economy experts have taken over the leadership of the West German economy again and their mercenary scribblers are back at work again turning out streams of drivel about war economy "theories", and drafting the measures of compulsion which rearmament would make necessary. All they have to do is to leaf through the dusty files of their own fascist writings and after slight modifications dish up their old tripe again. The notorious Lieutenant General von Metzsch stated:

> "Only when property is upheld, that is to say when economy has been put at the disposal of war policy, when it has become war economy, can the riches be regarded as being held in security for the nation." (von Metzsch "Wehrpolitik" Berlin 1939.)

His pupil and "bright young man" of yesterday whom Hitler made a professor, Major Kurt Hesse, whose ambition it is to become Adenauer's "General Thomas", (General Thomas was chief of Hitler's staff of war economists) stated in his secret memorandum: "Die deutsche Wirtschaftspolitik 1950/51", that "a use of German economy for armament purposes" could not be separated from remilitarisation and that the affirmation or rejection of armament in Europe also meant "the recognition or rejection of armament economy".

Since the Bonn government of remilitarisation and their imperialist masters are very much in favour of armaments they have decided quite clearly for "arms economy". Hesse continued his line of thought as follows: "In this connection the attitude of the workers is particularily important."

The idea of this has caused Bonn to indulge in "arms economy" but to deny the fact under all circumstances. Hesse however has secretly been promoted adviser for the strategic siting of West German economy to the Bonn government, and from this position he is able to exert "theoretical" control over the entire change-over of the West German economy to armaments production.

Compulsory war economy is in course of construction

The decisive step towards imposing a compulsory war economy by Bonn was the so-called "Law on security measures in certain branches of manufacturing" of March 9th, 1951. (Published in "Bundesgesetzblatt part I, No. 21, May 12th, 1951, p. 298—301.) This law gives the Bonn government the legal power to issue regulations on the production, manufacture, storage, delivery and purchase of solid fuels, mineral oils, precious metals and non-ferrous metals and the products made thereof. In addition the Bonn government may issue regulations on "the manufacture, use, and storage of manufactured goods, the delivery of these goods to the factories and their purchase by the factories". With this law the Bonn government has secured for itself almost unlimited possibilities for interfering with West German industry.

On the basis of this law the Bonn armaments cabinet has already issued eleven regulations about important raw materials. With these regulations it has taken new steps to switch West German industry over to war and remilitarisation. The "Neue Zeitung", organ of the American interventionists, made the following comment on these regulations:

> "These regulations represent the fulfilment of the promise made by the Federal Government in connection with the revision of the Occupation Statute that the government would cooperate in the distribution of vital raw materials for the joint defense of the West." (Munich No. 60 dated 12th March, 1951.)

The phrase about "defence" is used again and again for remilitarisation and rearmament. That shows the extent to which the armaments government in Bonn has to hide its true aims and demonstrates how strongly all sections of the German people oppose rearmament and remilitarisation.

The real meaning of the economic security law as a step towards a direction of raw materials for war industry is here openly admitted. A whole series of further

laws and regulations completes the picture of the new war economy. Examples are the law on dairy products and fats and the law on the sugar trade which provide the basis for the planned rationing of milk, butter and sugar. "The direction of raw materials" means really nothing else than that raw materials are reserved for the armaments industry and that peace industry is stopped from using them. At the same time it means the maximum restrictions on civilian consumption and therefore also the rationing of the main food stuffs.

Bonn's "Commissar for Raw Materials"

Bonn's next step towards a war economy was the "Law on the establishment of a Federal Bureau for Transport" of March 29th, 1951. This federal transport bureau instituted a system of priorities for goods delivery, import and export, foreign exchange facilities and in general functioned parallel to the organisations for the direction of raw materials set up by American imperialism. Finally commissars for raw materials were named for the various branches of raw material: coal, steel and iron, chemical raw materials, non-ferrous metals and textiles. These appointments followed immediately after the Federal Association of Industry had presented the Bonn government, on March 15th, 1951, with a confidential memorandum which stated:

> "It is advisable to appoint Federal Commissioners with experience in economic practice and economic organisation and who have the confidence of industry. These persons should give up their businesses for a term to be decided later and concentrate entirely upon tackling the problems of central organisation. They should do this in cooperation with a number of persons still active in industry, particularily with the various trade associations."

The wishes of the leading associations of monopolies in West Germany have always been law for the Bonn government and the Commissar for Raw Materials and his assistants were promptly appointed. The various monopolies naturally made sure that they would have the right influence by ensuring that "their" man was appointed for the branch in which they were interested. The General Director of the "Harburger Gummiwarenfabrik Phoenix", Otto A. Friedrich, who has particularily good and long-standing connections with the United States, became Chief Commissar for Raw Materials. Dr. Martin Sogemeier, former manager of the Ruhr coalmining group in the fascist "Wirtschaftsgruppe Bergbau" who naturally has great experience in war economy, was put in charge of coal. Herr Menne, President of the Association of the Chemical Industry and General Director of the "Internationale Gallalith Gesellschaft", was put in charge of the chemical industry. M. C. Müller, for many years director of the steel and iron industrial group, was appointed to superintend steel and iron. N. H. Schilling, General Director of the "Bremer Wollkämmerei", will superintend textiles and Herr Afflerbach, General Director of the aluminium factory in Lünen, will look after non-ferrous metals. It can be seen that all those appointed are the trusted representatives of the decisive monopolies concerned.

The measures detailed give a picture of the most important steps by which West German economy is being converted to war economy. Logically the next steps will be a further restriction of the consumer goods industries, the introduction of rationing and the change-over to the open production of armaments

on a large scale. Thus West German monopolists are systematically proceeding with the remilitarisation of the economic life, using the old recipe of the fascist arms economy.

Foreign trade in the service of remilitarisation

What is true of production and consumption is naturally also true of foreign trade, which the arms politicans have put completely at the service of war preparations. Foreign trade must provide the raw materials necessary for rearmament, which are not available inside the country, and must also support the war economy of its allies. All imports which are not necessary for rearmament have to stop.

In April and May 1951 West German foreign trade balanced for the first time since the end of the war, that is to say goods to the same value were imported and exported. In 1950 there was still a foreign trade deficit of over 3,000 million marks. This balancing of trade was, however, not achieved mainly by increasing exports but by a relative cut in imports. The imports of industrial raw materials in May 1951 were 40 % higher than the 1950 average but the imports of foodstuffs had increased only by 8 %. These figures give the value of the imports however. Since the American imperialist aggression in Korea had led to a rapid increase in all prices, actually much less was imported for these larger sums of money than the 1950 average. In quantity the amount of food stuff imported in May 1951 was about 10 % lower than the average of 1950.

This means that the necessary raw materials are being provided for the arms industry, cost what it may, and even at the expense of the people's food.

The drop in the standard of living of the working classes is shown clearly by an investigation of which foodstuffs have been imported in increased quantities and which in decreased quantities. A comparison between the 1950 average and the average of the first four months of 1951 shows quite clearly a change-over from high-grade to lower-grade foodstuffs. In this period for instance the import of butter dropped from 3,800,000 kilogrammes to 1,900,000 kilogrammes, that is to say exactly half. The import of meat and meat products dropped from 10,900,000 kilogrammes to 9,000,000 kilogrammes. The import of wheat on the other hand increased from 143,700,000 kilogrammes to 197,800,000 kilogrammes.

On the export side the export of goods necessary for war, and needed for rearmament has particularily increased. First place is taken by chemical products, important basic materials for munitions production. Rolled steel products, machines, electro-technical products, and precision and optical instruments ranging from field glasses to bomb sights are also on the list.

The manner in which West German export is being directed more and more exclusively to meet the needs of imperialist armament has the logical consequence of cutting it off from the growing peace economy of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic. In an article in the West German economic supplement of the New York "Journal of Commerce", the Bonn Commissar of Raw Materials, Otto A. Friedrich, described trade relations with the Soviet Union as "a crippling of the will to resist" which could do "immeasurable harm both economically and politically". ("Die Neue Zeitung", Munich, No. 97, of April 25th 1951.) In an unpublished speech in Har-

burg he declared quite candidly that he saw it as his job to stop completely East-West trade and trade between the two halves of Germany. He has thus shown himself for what he really is: an agent of American monopoly capital.

A complete stoppage of the East-West trade and trade between the two halves of Germany is intended to tie German imperialism even more closely to the American monopolists. As compensation the German imperialists are promised that they will have the entire Eastern market after the planned war. This promise is a poor consolation for West German economy.

Arms' imports

It may thus be seen that foreign trade too is only a means by which German and American imperialists prepare a Third World War. "Professor" Hesse quoted above stated in his secret memorandum:

> "Trade agreements concluded or renewed in the future must be vetted to see that they are in accordance with the requirements of arms economy. Foreign trade will also have to be developed with the aim of slowly building up reserves."

Bonn is acting on this recipe but the "building up of reserves" has not been particularily successful. West German foreign trade is still in such a precarious position that it has not even been possible to accumulate the normal reserves needed by peaceful economy to meet emergencies. In Bonn's eyes strategic raw materials are more important than the grain, fat and other basic foodstuffs needed by the people.

In the middle of 1950 JEIA Regulation No. 29, which governs the allocation of foreign currency for the import of certain goods, was altered. Since this date applications for the import of these goods must be directed to the Ministry of Trade in Bonn The goods concerned in one group include raw materials and equipment "in relation to atomic energy" ranging from uranium through cyclotrones to Geiger-counters—that is to say all the things necessary for producing atomic weapons. In the other group may be found all weapons and "military means of destruction" ranging from artillery and shells, poison gas, tanks and battleships to bombers. The announcement in question can be found in the "Bundesanzeiger," No. 132, dated July 13th 1950, p. 2 and 3.

Why had the import of weapons and instruments for atomic research suddenly become so important that a special regulation had to be issued about it? The militarists in Washington and in Bonn were obviously in a hurry to rearm the West German mercenary units and wanted to clear out of the way any bureaucratic difficulties in importing the necessary weapons. It may be assumed that in the meantime great quantities of the weapons of destruction described have been imported. The issue of regulations for the import of the heaviest offensive weapons only five years after the end of the most destructive of all wars constitutes one of the most dastardly steps of the Bonn government in its drive to rearmament and the preparation of war.

Summing up, it can be said that the West German economy has reached the point at which it is ready for open and complete rearmament. Bonn's pet theorist for war economy, Hesse, prepared a short programme of preparatory

measures in his memorandum addressed to the rearmament government. This programme stated in part:

"(a) Examination of statistics

(d) Ascertaining the free capacity in the industries suitable for arms production

(k) Planning the official organisation

(m) planning the establishment of technical armaments commissions of various sorts

(r) introduction of a campaign to convince the workers of the necessity for the arms drive."

This programme has been in the main fulfilled. The most important basis for this was the economic security law which gave the remilitarisation cabinet and its Minister of Trade dictatorial powers. The right-wing leaders of the trade unions and of Schumacher's Social Democratic Party are unofficially responsible for carrying out Hesse's last point. They try every day to explain the "necessity for the arms drive" without any success, since the workers have learnt the lesson of two wars and the poverty which they brought with them and know that an arms drive means war. They, however, want peace.

The workers bear the brunt of rearmament

The West German workers choose peace with even more determination since they can already see for themselves what rearmament will bring them. The poverty caused by the Second World War has by no means been overcome and the poverty which accompanies the preparations for a third world war is already making itself felt.

The enormous costs already caused by the armaments measures have to be borne entirely by the working population of West Germany. This burden is passed on to the masses by continuous reduction of real wages and increasing exploitation of the workers. In addition the war preparations are accompanied by growing shortages and a drop in the quality of ordinary consumer goods. The hysterical arms drive in the United States and Western Europe since the American attack on the Korean people has sent all prices on the world market shooting up. According to official Bonn statistics the prices for basic food-stuffs have risen as follows:

Rise in some basic food prices

May, 1951, compared to May, 1950

	in percentages
Rye	48.9
Wheat	52.3
Cattle	23.5
Pigs	15.2

The same tendency has been apparent in the prices of industrial products. Prices in the leather and shoe branches rose 27 % from May, 1950, to May, 1951, and prices for textiles and clothing by 44 % in the same period. In the middle of May the bread price was 34 % above that of June 15th, 1950, the price of white flour was 57 % higher and pork was 20 % higher. The average weekly earnings of West German workers only increased 13 % from March, 1950, to March, 1951,

according to the opitimistic statistics put out by Bonn. Even Victor Agartz, the head of the Trade Union Institute of Economics in Cologne, and member of the Council of the German Trade Union Federation (DGB) found it necessary to say:

> "Nominal wages remaining at the same level and rapidly rising prices brought a rapid decrease in the real wage." (Wages, prices and social assistance by Victor Agartz, "Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte", Cologne, 2nd yr., vol. 2, February 1951.)

Raising prices while wages remain practically constant is only one way of depressing real income. Another way is to pass on tax burdens to the working population, a method which Bonn continues to use with the utmost craft. The proportion of the tax sum paid by each section of the population can be fairly accurately determined by selecting the tax groups mainly composed of working people. This method gives according to official West German statistics, the following result:

Proportion of tax payments (in percentages)

Year		Workers	Employers
1946/47		51.3	48.7
1947/48		53.3	46.7
1948/49		58.3	41.7
1949/1950		68.1	31.9
1950/51	1st quarter	67.2	32.8
	2nd quarter	72.9	28.5
	3rd quarter	72.5	27.5
	January/February	82.6	17.4

The further rearmament went the heavier were the tax burdens on the workers and office employees.

The increasing exploitation of the workers may be seen in the number of hours worked weekly in industry, which is already higher in West Germany than it was during the period of fascist armament. In 1936 45.6 hours were worked weekly, in 1938 46.5 hours and in March 1951 49.9 hours.

Another form of increasing exploitation is the speed-up which is expressed in rising production figures. From April 1950 until April 1951 the intensity of work in the whole of industry rose by 17 %. In certain branches, particularily those important for rearmament and most closely controlled by American finance capital the rise was even bigger. In the electrical industry intensity of work rose 28 %, in the coal products industry by 34 % and in the oil industry by 22 %. In those industries producing consumer goods work intensity is still 20 or 30 % below the pre-war level.

The arms drive by German imperialism is continuously depressing the standard of the working people. For the great trusts and monopolies, however, the day of enormous profits has dawned again. The annual reports of the big joint stock companies are unable to conceal this fact any longer. The workers' share in the national income is steadily decreasing while the share of the German imperialists, who are driving ahead with their policy of remilitarisation and war for just this reason, is steadily rising. The Trade Union Institute of

Economics has published the following statistics on the change in the share of the national income enjoyed by the workers on one side and by the employer on the other.

National Income split in Wage and Profit
(in percentages)

Year	Wages and salaries	Profits
1948, June	83	17
September	43	57
December	43	57
1949, March	37	63
June	40	60
September	37	63
December	39	61
1950, March	39	61
June	37	63
September	35	65
December	35	65

(Information published by the Trade Union Institute of Economics. Cologne, 1951, No. 4.)

Although the calculations of the Trade Union Institute may be challenged because they tend to make the profit portion appear too small and the wage portion too large, the table gives a picture of the deterioration in the position of the working people and the enormous profits made by the trusts and monopolies in West Germany as a result of the unchecked policy of rearmament followed by Bonn. The Bonn arms cabinet uses all possible methods to breed poverty and misery in West Germany. Nothing is done to remove the shocking poverty in which the resettlers live. The plight of the unemployed grows worse daily, particularily since for a growing number of people unemployment has become a permanent state of affairs. Hundreds of thousands of young people can find neither apprenticeships nor jobs and face the alternative of joining either a "German" or foreign mercenary unit or "trying their fortunes abroad". The increasing measures of remilitarisation will make the poverty even worse. The shocking plight of the German people is intended to make them ready to look upon war as a way out of the situation which has been purposely produced by the German imperialists.

The Bonn militarists call their preparations for war "the defence of freedom". The workers are expected to defend their "freedom" to live in the misery caused by German imperialism. They are expected to defend Krupp's and Thyssen's and Mannesmann's freedom to make ever increasing profits and to seize new markets. What other "freedom" can be imagined under the leadership of German monopolists and under the command of nazi war criminals like General Speidel and General Heusinger?

The German workers can only conquer and defend their freedom by fighting against German and foreign imperialism, by fighting against all measures of remilitarisation, by fighting for the preservation and strengthening of peace.

IV.

THE BONN WEST ZONAL STATE–MADE IN USA

1. The Bonn West Zonal State was created for American war 87

"National equality"—a preconcerted plot 87 / War is the reason for the existence of the West German separatist state and for its reactionary character 88 / Renazification and remilitarisation go hand in hand 88

2. The Bonn cabinet of militarists in action against peace 89

Ban on the plebiscite on German remilitarisation 89 / Bonn Parliament debates the ban 90 / A negation of democracy—shutting the people's mouths 92 / The prelude to the ban on the plebiscite 92 / Free German Youth banned in West Germany because they fight for peace 93 / The real reason for the ban 94 / The right to refuse military service would make the introduction of conscription difficult 95 / Lehr's police in action against children 96

3. Neo-fascism flourishes in the garden of remilitarisation 96

The "Bund deutscher Jugend" 96 / United States espionage organisations exposed and liquidated 98 / Americans spies and agents 98 / The "First Legion" 99 / Minister appeals to young terrorists 100 / Government money for neo-fascist organisations 100 / Legalised "Werwolves" 100 / The "Brotherhood"—agents of the occupation powers in West Germany 100 / Ex-servicemen's organisations 101 / Armoured corps "Greater Germany" 101 / The parachutists 102

4. Laws on the nazi pattern 103

The Bonn convict law of 9/10th July 1951 103 / Hamburg newspaper attacks Bonn convict law 104 / Coburg "Neue Presse" on the convict law 104 / Censorship regulation endangers political liberty 105 / The history of the Gestapo law 105 / Waves of terror against the Communist Party—ban on the council of the VVN 107

1. The Bonn West Zonal State was created for American war

"National equality"—a preconcerted plot

The Bonn West Zonal State was created in order to exploit the reserves of manpower, the economic potential and the territory of West Germany for the American war against the Soviet Union, against the German Democratic Republic and the European People's Democracies. The Bonn West Zonal State was established in 1949 after the ground work had been laid by the economic fusion of the American and British occupation zones in 1947, contrary to the Potsdam Agreement. By forming the Bonn State the Western powers tore up the Potsdam Agreement by which the four signatory powers had guaranteed German unity. The "separate existence" of West Germany as a state is intended to make it possible for her to enter the American war bloc as an "equal" treaty partner. This "national equality" is a fraud plotted by the Anglo-American warmongers on one side, and the German monopolists together with the generals and politicans who serve them on the other. The "separate existence" is the outward form arranged by these partners to make it possible for the West German Quislings to appear as treaty partners and to camouflage the rearmament of West Germany as a "free decision on the part of the Germans" and as a "voluntary defence contribution" of the Germans to the Atlantic bloc aggression pact. The lie of national equality has recently been reinforced by the declaration made by the Western powers and a number of their satellites that they regarded the state of war with Germany as at an end. By this step they wish to deprive the German people of the peace treaty, the rapid conclusion of which was promised in the Potsdam Agreement. The fraud about "equality" emphasised by the actions of the Western powers was shown up by Truman's message to Congress on the occasion of the "termination of the state of war with Germany" which stated:

> "The termination of the state of war with Germany will not affect the status of occupation. The rights of the occupation powers arise from the conquest of Germany and by ending the state of war we do not abandon these rights."

The rights granted to the Bonn remilitarisation cabinet are a mockery of all ideas of national sovereignty. They are "rights" which can be withdrawn at any time. This was particularily emphasised when the Bonn government was "allowed" to establish its own Ministry for Foreign Affairs. The "sovereignty" of the West German separatist state is shown above all by the fact that the occupation period was extended to 50 years and that Bonn was obliged to recognise retrospectively the debts of the First World War. By this means the Bonn West Zonal State has been bound even closer, both economically and politically, to dollar imperialism.

This "separate existence" is a sort of "sliding scale" by which this "sovereignty" can be extended or restricted exactly as the imperialist Western powers desire and in accordance with the good behaviour of the Bonn government. By means of this "equality" the Germans in West Germany actually get the "right" to place their reserves of manpower, their economic potential and their territory at the service of American war.

This "equality" is an old and time-worn formula used by American imperialism. In the Philipines, Latin America, during the American intervention in Soviet Russia, in Greece and in Korea, agents bought with Wall Street money have been installed by the United States as governments with "equal" rights. The United States has made treaties with them and at the slightest provocation the United States has always been ready to hurry to the help of its always "harassed" allies armed to the teeth. That is also the reason for the existence of the "equal rights" given to the Bonn West Zonal state, a "state" made in USA.

War is the reason for the existence of the West German separatist state and for its reactionary character

The German people like all other peoples do not want war. The overwhelming majority of the Germans in West Germany do not want war. The Anglo-American warmongers know that just as well as their political puppets in Bonn. The United States supplies the armament material for war and the German "McCloyists" from Adenauer to Schumacher regard it as their most urgent task to make the West German population ready for war. The overwhelming majority of the Germans in the Western zones are very much opposed to war but the eagerness of the Anglo-American slavedrivers to get down to their war is even greater. This contradiction has determined the reactionary character of the West German separatist state. Using the methods of fraud and political suppression the Bonn government attempts to "coordinate" the minds of the West German people and make them "ready in spirit" for the American war. For this purpose the West German state uses the means and methods of nazi policy and to a certain extent also the same staff, who are happy to put their nazi experiences at the disposal of the Bonn state. A typical example of this was the resignation of the Bonn Minister of the Interior, Heinemann, who rejected the remilitarisation of West Germany and his replacement by Dr. Lehr who was able to put his nazi "experiences" at the disposal of the Bonn government as "democratic" police minister in which post he helps towards rearmament. Remilitarisation demands renazification and vice versa. This must be remembered when considering the internal policy of the Bonn government.

Renazification and remilitarisation go hand in hand

When considering the stage reached by renazification in West Germany it is necessary to remember that Anglo-American imperialism in its own home territories uses the "democratic" variety of capitalist class rule; but it must also be remembered that these imperialisms are turning in increasing measure to the methods of fraud and terror used by fascism and are covering this up with a smoke screen of democratic phrases. They have passed on these government methods to the Adenauer cabinet. The nazi form of fascism appeared as open enemy of bourgeois democracy. Neo-fascism, copying the American pattern, uses phrases about "democracy" and "liberty" to mask its real character. Thus the suitable partners for this American variant of bourgeois democracy are the government parties of Bonn and the "opposition" party of Schumacher's Social Democrats. German monopoly capital as junior partner of Anglo-American imperialism is supplying the Anglo-American imperialists with its ample

experiences in the field of fascist fraud and terror. For this purpose it uses, apart from the government parties and the Social Democrats, a complicated network of reactionary and neo-fascist organisations—there are more than 70 of them in West Germany—in order to harness as many sections of the people as possible, on various excuses, to the chariot of war. *All these parties and organisations have one thing in common, politically: anti-Communism and enmity for the Soviet Union.* Something new for all these groups, including the neo-fascist group, is that they use not only nationalism in order ideologically to camouflage the aims of German imperialism, but also in increasing measure cosmopolitanism expressed in "Europeanism." This new line has been laid down by the American-British senior partners for German monopoly capital and its political standard bearers. German monopoly capital and its "democratic" and neo-fascist theorists have accepted this idea largely because of irresponsible speculation on the economic power of German monopoly capital and the chance to become the leading power in Europe through war against the Soviet Union. Apart from this it is no great jump from the nazi idea of a "United Europe," called "Fortress of Europe" in nazi war slang, to the phrases about "Europeanism" and "European nation" used today in all sorts of varieties by "democratic" and neo-fascist groups. The idea of "German leadership" in such a union has of course not been abandoned.

2. The Bonn cabinet of militarists in action against peace

The reason for the existence of the West German separate state is the preparation of war. The many-sided busy activity of the Bonn cabinet of militarists has one moving force: the preparation of war. Its whole activity can be summed up by slightly altering the once famous phrase of a leading nazi: "When I hear the word 'peace' I reach for my gun."

The Bonn government itself supplies proof of the fact that it is doing nothing except prepare for war. Some of the more striking examples of laws passed by the Bonn government follow.

Ban on the plebiscite on German remilitarisation

On April 24th 1951, the Bonn cabinet took the decision to ban the plebiscite against remilitarisation and for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951. The ban was based on Article 9, Paragraph 2 of the Bonn Basic Law, on the argument that the plebiscite represented an attack on constitutional law and order in the Federal Republic.

The evidence taken as reason for the ban was the plebiscite text submitted by the Plebiscite Committee after its meeting in Essen on January 28th, 1951, asking for a legal plebiscite. This text read "Are you opposed to the remilitarisation of Germany and in favour of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951?" The real reason for the ban was the great increase in the mass movement in West Germany against remilitarisation. This movement had affected all sections of the population. The Bonn cabinet of militarists saw in this fact a hindrance for its anti-democratic efforts to harness the people of West Germany to the war chariots of the German and American imperialists.

Article 9, paragraph 2 of the Bonn Basic Law on which the ban was based states: "Associations are prohibited the aims or activities of which are contrary to the Criminal Code or constitutional law and order, or the spirit of international understanding."

It follows from this interpretation of the Basic Law that to oppose West German remilitarisation is to act contrary to the Bonn Criminal Code. Anyone who opposes West German remilitarisation and supports a peace treaty with Germany is an enemy of constitutional law and order in the Bonn West Zonal State From this point of view the reasons given for the ban are completely logical and confirm what has been said above about the reason for the existence of the West German separatist state. The idea, however, that war is a means of achieving international understanding and that thus anyone who wants a peace treaty is opposed to the spirit of international understanding is the sort of "logic" which can only be used by people mad for war, people who see in war the only way out of the blind alley into which they have run.

Bonn Parliament debates the ban

On April 26th 1951, after the ban on the plebiscite, the Bonn Parliament met to debate "a motion of the fractions of the CDU/CSU, FDP (Free Democratic Party), DP (German Party), BP (Bavarian Party) with regard to unconstitutional plebiscite." The CDU member Brookmann opening the debate said: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the reason for this motion is to find out from the government what it intends to do about this action. I should like to start by expressing a certain satisfaction that the Ministry for All-German Questions, immediately after the establishment of this Plebiscite Committee, reacted by issuing a communique to the press explaining the situation to the German public. I believe that this is not enough. Political declarations or demonstrations

(Deputy Rische: You want police!)

are no longer enough today.

(Dep. Rische: You want jails!)

We want to hear from the government what measures they intend to take to prevent this unconstitutional action."

(Dep. Renner: Oh yes, I can imagine what you feel like.)

Police Minister Dr. Lehr giving his reasons for the ban said: "I have the honour to give the reasons for the decision taken by the Federal Government on my application on April 24th 1951, which was signed by the Chancellor and myself. All the power of the political organisations of Communism has been put into action according to plan for the plebiscite against remilitarisation and for the conclusion of a peace treaty in 1951.

(Shouts of 'Bravo!' from the Communist Party of Germany—KPD)

The action aims at upsetting constitutional law and order in the federal territory.

(Dep. Renner: Oh dear, dear, dear)

Grotewohl called on July 21st, 1950, for national resistance against the Federal Republic.

(Dep. Paul: Against the colonial policy of the Federal Government)

In August 1950 Ulbricht proclaimed that it was a national right of the German people to ignore the laws and regulations of the Federal Republic. The theses for the Party Conference of the KPD published in February 1951 called for an active resistance movement against remilitarisation.

(Shout from the KPD: Quite right too!)

The European Workers' Conference which met in East Berlin in March this year issued as a slogan for the working class the plebiscite against the remilitarisation of Germany.

(Shouts of hear, hear! from the KPD—Dep. Rische: That's what we want, that is the worker's slogan)

In Essen in January 1951 it was decided to set up a big united organisation to prepare the plebiscite. The danger of this plebiscite action is also clearly to be seen from Ulbricht's Thälmann speech, held in the middle of this month. This speech demanded active resistance against the remilitarisation in Germany

(Shout from the KPD: Rightly so!)

and great demonstrations and mass strikes were mentioned. In this Thälmann speech Ulbricht stated: 'He who does not take part in the plebiscite against the remilitarisation of West Germany and for a peace treaty in 1951 will share the guilt in the crime being prepared by Eisenhower, Adenauer and company.'

(Hear, hear! from the KPD)

In the meantime — I would call the attention of the ladies and gentlemen to the steps which have already been taken — a main committee, provincial committees and town and factory committees have already been established on federal territory.

(Dep. Rische: That's fine!)

Local votes and collections of signatures have taken place.

(Dep. Rische: That is the people's voice!)

The investigation into the opinion of the people by means of an unofficial questionaire is nothing unusual in a democratic state

(Dep. Renner: Aha!)

and under ordinary circumstances nothing could be said against this. This may also be proved by the many lawyers who certain people have commissioned in an attempt to establish the legality of this action.

(Dep. Renner: "Commissioned" is good!)

The Federal government has drawn the necessary conclusion from all this. On my application it has taken a unanimous decision signed by the Chancellor and countersigned by myself as I already stated. If one province is not able through the use of its own police forces

(Dep. Renner: Aha, now we are getting to it!)

to deal with the enemies of the state the Federal government is determined to accept an application to intervene according to article 91 of the Basic Law and take the necessary measures."

(Applause from the government parties — Dep. Renner: Listen to the Steel Trust talking. We've been through all this before.)

A negation of democracy—shutting the people's mouths

Frau Wessel (Zentrum party) spoke on the question of the constitutional legality of the plebiscite and stated in part: "I was interested to hear the statement made by my colleague, Herr Brookmann. It will interest him to know that no lesser person that the former Minister of the Interior, Dr. Heinemann, who as far as I know, still belongs to the CDU and cannot possibly be suspected of being a Communist, has expressed himself both in speeches and in articles as in favour of an informative questioning of the West German population on this subject. The point of view adopted by Dr. Heinemann is: Although there is no provision for a plebiscite binding in law there can be no legal objection to a plebiscite which gives parliament and the government an idea of the real opinion of the people. Such a plebiscite does not remove the right of decision from the hands of parliament but strengthens the feeling of responsibility.

I have allowed myself, ladies and gentlemen, to repeat this statement of Dr. Heinemann, who as former Minister of the Interior must know the Basic Law, because it appears important and necessary to clarify the question whence the appeal to the people on the question of rearmament first came. In addition I should like to point to the statement of another opponent of the Communists at least equally free from suspicion, Dr. Schumacher, who demanded even more sharply an appeal to the people.

(Shout from the left: "That's right!")

By methods like these, ladies and gentlemen, you are creating the strong impression among the people that they are to be gagged and not asked their opinion. Using methods like this without regard to the constitution you are going along the road to an authoritarian state, the very negation of democracy."

These quotations come from the official minutes of the Bonn Parliament. The debate has been dealt with at such length because of its importance for the existence of the Germans as a nation.

The prelude to the ban on the plebiscite

There was an interesting prelude to the ban on the plebiscite. The Berlin "National-Zeitung" gave the following interesting details of this on January 25th 1951:

> "From well-informed sources we learn the following details of the meeting which took place in Bad Homburg on Monday between Eisenhower and Adenauer and the subsequent conversation with Ollenhauer, Deputy Chairman of the Social Democratic Party and the prominent generals, Speidel and Heusinger. Eisenhower expressed his great dissatisfaction at the results of investigations carried out by the United States Military Information Authorities, all of which agreed that 85 % of the West German population were opposed to rearmament. He demanded categorically that under no circumstances should a plebiscite on West German rearmament be allowed.
>
> Adenauer gave an assurance that he would allow no such plebiscite and Ollenhauer promised that the Social Democratic leadership would strongly

oppose the carrying out of such a plebiscite. Adenauer underlined the assurances he had previously given to the American High Commissioner, McCloy, and stated 'rearmament will take place'.

In the further course of the conference between Eisenhower and Adenauer the United States General stressed the necessity of creating the correct 'psychological climate' for carrying out his policy. In this connection he expressed his uneasiness at the growing campaign of certain groups and newspapers against rearmament. Adenauer emphasised that measures were being prepared to prevent this. He permitted himself to make the proposal that the Americans should make 'a gesture' which would make it more easy for the Federal Government to influence public opinion.

Eisenhower said he believed that the planned declaration on the ending of the state of war with Germany would undoubtedly serve this end, although of course the existing controls over German economic and foreign policy would have to be retained. The Federal Government would also have to make it clear that such an official declaration would not only not be followed by a withdrawal of occupation troops but by their reinforcement.

Adenauer stated that he was fully in agreement with this and pointed out that he was acting in unison with Dr. Schumacher in his wish for a reinforcement of the American troops in West Germany.

After this conference Eisenhower told leading American officials that he was absolutely certain that he could rely on Adenauer."

The development of political events in West Germany since the end of January 1951 has proved the complete reliability of the "National-Zeitung" report.

Free German Youth banned in West Germany because they fight for peace

On June 26th 1951, the following "Decision of the Federal Government with regard to the Free German Youth (FDJ)" was published:

"The Federal Government has decided:

(1) The activities of the Free German Youth (FDJ) represent an attack on constitutional law and order in the Federal Republic. The FDJ is, therefore, banned in accordance with article 9, paragraph 2 of the Basic Law.

(2) Provincial governments are requested to prevent all activities in the spirit of the FDJ in accordance with paragraph 5, section 1 of the Law on cooperation of the federation and the provinces for the protection of the constitution of September 27th, 1950 (Bundesgesetzblatt, p. 682)."

The ban is signed by Federal Chancellor Adenauer and Minister of the Interior Dr. Lehr. Up to July 4th, according to the Berlin edition of the "Neue Zeitung" of that date, the ban of the FDJ issued by the Federal Government had been put into effect in nine West German provinces. No decision had been taken by the provincial governments in Württemberg-Baden and Bremen.

The decision of the Federal Government was accompanied a list of reasons. This list made it clear that the ban was imposed because of the active fight of the FDJ against remilitarisation and in favour of peace and the unity of Germany. The reasons given were:

(1) The members of the Central Secretariat of the FDJ and other FDJ members are active in "the Central Council of the National Front." The purpose of this body is "to carry out national resistance in West Germany against the constitutional government of the Federal Republic." This is official proof of the fact that the Bonn cabinet of militarists persecutes the national resistance against remilitarisation and the American-British foreign rulership.

(2) There is a close connection between the FDJ and the Communist Party. The FDJ is closely associated with carrying out the action for "a plebiscite against remilitarisation" and the preparation for the "so-called" World Youth Festival 1951.

(3) On September 24th 1950, at the first rally of the mining union in Bochum members of the FDJ stopped Federal President Heuss from speaking by promoting disorders "so that he had to interrupt his speech often and for long periods."

(4) "The FDJ acting through the 'Committee of young fighters for peace' which it had set up called a mass demonstration in Dortmund for October 1st 1950, under the title of 'Rally of the 100,000 young fighters for peace' and carried out a recruiting compaign among the youth in all parts of federal territory."

(5) Bans of FDJ meetings were quoted which had been announced by the provincial governments of North-Rhine Westphalia, Bavaria and Hessen in September 1950.

(6) "The ban pronounced by the Federal Government on April 24th 1951 ... on the preparation and carrying out of 'the plebiscite against remilitarisation and in favour of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951' has been repeatedly contravened in the federal territory by the FDJ."

(7) The newspaper of the FDJ had "continued to make propaganda for the 'plebiscite' despite the ban." The "Junge Welt" had carried "caricatures of Federal Chancellor Dr. Adenauer and the Chairman of the Social Democratic Party Dr. Schumacher directed against the ban promulgated against the 'plebiscite' in the Federal Republic, and containing sharp personal attacks."

These are the "reasons" for the ban on the FDJ. The FDJ and its active fight are only honoured by the ban pronounced on them for working for peace and against remilitarisation, for fighting for the national unity of Germany and against the treacherous "splitting government" of Adenauer.

The real reason for the ban

The new German mass army for the American war needs recruits; that is the real but unpronounced reason for the ban. The cadres are already being established at full speed and the introduction of conscription is just around the corner. McCloy has categorically demanded a speed-up in rearmament. "It is reported that the Americans are interested in well trained, healthy young recruits between the ages of 18 and 24 and specialists up to 35 years old." ("Kasseler Zeitung", January 25th 1951.) One of Hitler's tank experts, General Freiherr von Manteuffel, made his offer in May 1950 when

he told the British correspondent Clifford: "After all you need us. We can provide for 30 armoured divisions and probably more. The age-groups which are just reaching military age are particularily strong—the first results of Hitler's special provisions for big families." ("Daily Mail," London, May 19th, 1950.) According to the "Neue Ruhrzeitung,' Essen, on June 8th, 1951, General de Gaulle had demanded that West Germany established forty divisions. They are all out for the young people organised in the FDJ and for all young people for whom the FDJ is fighting so that they can enjoy a future without war. Young fighters for peace are of no use for American war. That is why the American stooges who call themselves Ministers ban the FDJ.

The right to refuse military service would make the introduction of conscription difficult

At the beginning of 1951 the following document which needs no comment became known:

> "Minister of the Interior, Dr. Lehr, to
> Secretary of State Hans Ritter von Lex,
> Federal Chancellery, Bonn.
>
> Secret! Very urgent!
>
> Ref. No. 1101 A—1239/50 (Cabinet business)
>
> I have provisionally answered the question of the Zentrum fraction to the Federal Government about the creation of a law giving the right to refuse military service—Agenda Item No. 1548—by stating that a number of enquiries still have to be made and that therefore a final answer can only be expected in two or three weeks at the earliest.
>
> The draft of a law for the refusal of military service has been worked out in my Ministry in the meantime. I have not yet submitted the draft to the cabinet because in my opinion the Federal Government must first decide whether such a law should be introduced before or after the draft of a possible conscription law."

Dr. Lehr then complained of the inhibitions of the German people against the reintroduction of conscription "in whatever form" and continued:

> "If the law giving the right to refuse military service was issued before a conscription law it would be very possible that a large number of people would apply for their cases to be considered by the tribunals foreseen, and that the introduction of a conscription law would thereby be made difficult. This could lead to very unpleasant results, particularily in the foreign policy field.
>
> In addition it should be noted that from a juridicial point of view a law giving the right to refuse military service is not necessary since the sections of the Basic Law ensuring release from military service under certain conditions will not become important until conscription is introduced."

On January 22nd 1951, Adenauer met Eisenhower in Bad Homburg. Eisenhower demanded the deletion of paragraph 4 of the Bonn Basic Law which states:

"No person may be forced against his conscience to perform armed military service."

According to reports from Bonn Adenauer himself proposed to Eisenhower the abolition of this paragraph 4 of the Basic Law.

> "By putting this demand into effect the last legal obstacles will be removed to the introduction of conscription in West Germany and therewith service as mercenaries in the American 'European Army' will become compulsory."
>
> ("National-Zeitung" Berlin, January 24th 1951.)

Lehr's police in action against children

On July 8th, 1951, the Bonn Police Minister, Dr. Lehr, mobilised all available police troops for a new and incredible criminal onslaught against the German people and German unity. The police were sent into action to prevent, illegally, 6,000 workers' children from West Germany from travelling to holiday homes in the German Democratic Republic. All the children and those travelling with them were armed with the necessary papers, permits and interzonal passes. The grown-ups accompanying the children were mostly arrested. The West German "war communique" stated that the action was the "greatest undertaken by the police up to date since the war". It was directed against the childrens' holiday convoys which can be proved to have consisted of the young children of West German unemployed and workers from industrial cities. The zonal frontier was occupied to a great depth by Lehr's police troops who patrolled along the entire length of the demarcation line with bloodhounds and tanks in order to catch the convoys. In Lower Saxony alone 3,000 police officials, including four new alert squads, were concentrated for the job. Near Hanover, Brunswick, Lübeck und Hamburg Lehr's troops stormed the buses and steamers which the children were using, threw the children into their squad cars, and cross-examined them for many hours before returning them by devious routes to their points of departure.

3. Neo-fascism flourishes in the garden of remilitarisation

Interrupting the list of bans here is a case of "encouragement of youth" by the Adenauer government. This case too is proof that war is the only reason for the existence of the Bonn government.

The "Bund deutscher Jugend"

The central offices of the neo-fascist organisation, "Bund deutscher Jugend" (Federation of German Youth) are situated in 13, Feldbergstrasse, Frankfurt/Main. In extravagantly furnished rooms the former officers and Hitler Youth leaders, Peters, Waldow, Reinhardt and others, who describe themselves as "political refugees" from East Germany, have their offices. One of the leaders and chief propagandist of the BDJ is Dr. Paul Lüth, of the Wehrmacht medical service who formerly worked on the "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung", the Chief Editor of which made himself notorious by demanding the creation of

a "atom bomb curtain" right across the Soviet Union. Lüth is the founder of the central organ of the BDJ called "Der deutsche Beobachter". The organisation has a lot of money at its disposal. Up to the beginning of 1951 industry, led by the Coca-Cola GmbH, a subsidiary of the American Coca-Cola Trust, had contributed more than a million marks. The BDJ has the full support of the Americans. At a BDJ conference in Frankfurt in the middle of December 1950 Lüth praised the Americans as the "Romans of this century" and "the people who guarantee our victory". The BDJ leader Hamacher stated that the BDJ was a youth organisation which "fights against Bolshevism and particularly against the Free German Youth. Some weeks earlier it had won a strong ally, the "Emergency Committee of German parachutists" founded in Munich by Lieutenant-Colonel Lauer. This Emergency Committee would be organised into a militant mobile group, Hamacher said. "A strong man will arise and the BDJ and the Emergency Committee will be the vanguard of the fight which will then begin."

> "Die Welt", Hamburg, stated on January 23rd 1951: "In three indentical letters addressed to President Truman, General Eisenhower and McCloy the 'Bund deutscher Jugend' has demanded Germany's inclusion in the 'defence belt of the free world'... This belt must not be allowed to follow the line of the Pyrenees and the Alps whatever happens."

The BDJ, which is closely connected with the notorious neo-fascist organisation, "First Legion", follows the fascist pattern in acts of terror against all democratic and progressive forces in Germany.

The BDJ works closely together with Kaiser's Ministry for All-German Affairs, ill famed for its espionage and diversionist activities and with the Security Department and the Constitutional Defence Department of the Bonn government.

> "The American secret service—the CIC—has established a new espionage organisation named 'Berlin Federation of German Youth' which is intended to get into touch with young people in the Democratic Sector of Berlin and the German Democratic Republic.
>
> The leaders of this Youth Federation are former SS officers and leading members of the Hitler Youth. Many of them were trained for espionage jobs after 1945 in American Prisoner-of-War camps.
>
> The West Berlin Association has a nice house at 40, Wildenow Straße in Dahlem (American Sector).
>
> The leader is a certain Willi Erdbeer, who often explains that his youth federation has nothing to do with looking after youth but 'strictly political aims'. The organisation is financed partly by the CIC and partly by big West Berlin firms. 40,000 marks were put at its disposal as a first instalment and for the first 6 months of this year it expects to receive 25,000 marks monthly." ("National-Zeitung", Berlin, January 14th 1951.)

United States espionage organisations exposed and liquidated

The Ministry of State Security in the German Democratic Republic exposed and completely liquidated an organisation of spies and diversionists at the end of July 1951. All members were arrested.

This organisation which called itself "Free Parliament" was created by the Western Federation of German Youth (BDJ) on the orders of the American secret service from fascist and declassed elements.

The staff of the organisation had its headquarters at 40, Wildenow Strasse in the American Sector of Berlin. The activity of the organisation was financed and directed by the Americans and by West German industrialists. The members of the organisation were given the job of disrupting the 3rd World Festival of Youth and Students in Berlin, establishing terrorist gangs in the German Democratic Republic, collecting espionage information and distributing literature and leaflets preaching hate.

The members of the organisation planned to provoke unrest in the Democratic Sector of Berlin during the Festival, to disorganise transport and the means of communication and to scatter containers filled with incendiary material.

The leaders of that organisation will have to answer for their deeds before the courts of the German Democratic Republic. In the future too the Ministry of State Security, helped by the watchfulness of the German people and their desire to be able to work in peace, will ruthlessly extirpate all enemies of the people, mercenaries of the imperialist states of the West.

American spies and agents

In this connection reference must be made to another branch of the activities of American spies and agents, led by the Social Democrat, Professor Ernst Tillich. Tillich was a theologian and at one time belonged to a group of religious Socialists. He is a member of Schumacher's Social Democratic Party and after 1945 he worked in the social service section of the Berlin city administration and in the "Christian Aid Movement".

Tillich has been a paid agent of the Americans for years. Under the camouflage of charitable activity he runs the so-called "Fighting group against inhumanity", an espionage and sabotage organisation which works against the German Democratic Republic on the orders of Anglo-American imperialism.

This sabotage, espionage and murder organisation is a recruiting centre for all kinds of rabble who then infiltrate into the German Democratic Republic with criminal intent.

This criminal organisation has been working on an international scale for a considerable period and Tillich takes part in this work too. This shady character of German origin is the general representative for Berlin and the entire area of the German Democratic Republic on the "International Committee for the European Resistance Movement" founded in Paris, according to a report on January 27th 1951, in "Die Welt", the organ of the British occupation authorities. This international espionage and sabotage organisation has offices in Paris, Berlin, the Hague, Lucerne and Dusseldorf. At a press conference Tillich stated, according to "Die Welt" that the committee aimed to fight

against "defeatism in the West", (that means against the forces of peace), and to extend "moral and material help" to the "resistance fighters" in the German Democratic Republic (that means the infiltrated agents of the American war-mongers). Tillich stated that he wanted to carry on this criminal activity "beyond the Elbe' on a European basis and wished "to take the offensive". He emphasised that the forces taking part would preserve their "anonymity" where necessary and that he could therefore give no further details of the movement.

The "First Legion"

The "First Legion" named in the report on the BDJ was formed on Adenauer's orders. It is a further proof of the fact that the Adenauer government has "the interest of youth at heart" and also of the fact that remilitarisation and renazification go hand in hand in West Germany. At the end of January 1951 the American news agency United Press reported from Bonn:

> "About 100,000 young Germans in the Federal Republic have formed a 'First Legion' which describes itself as a 'Fighting community of German men'. The first aim of the Legion is to establish 'a united Germany on our old inherited soil'. It has no fixed programme but 'takes the necessary steps as occasion arises'.
>
> The central office of the Legion, the members of which include prominent politicians, are situated in Cologne. The Legion is led by a three man staff elected by a fifteen man directorate. The Legion is divided into provincial and district organisations the smallest of which is the ten man group. It is impossible to apply for membership. Legionaries are 'selected' after a long period of probation and after filling out a questionaire."

Legionaries are not allowed to have any connections with Communism. The following Members of Parliament were reportedly members of the new organisation: Kurt Kiesinger (CDU), Joachim von Meerkatz (DP) and Erich Mende (FDP).

The names of the directorate, who are chosen by the financial backers, that is to say the West German industrialists headed by the Cologne banker Pferdmenges who formerly financed Hitler, are kept secret.

Entry into the Legion is like joining a secret society. Legionaries must take an oath to the Legion and swear unquestioning obedience. They must declare themselves ready to carry out all orders, including those involving crimes and murder, given by the tribunal of the secret society.

The "First Legion" is divided into two branches, the "active group" composed of young men mentally and physically capable of carrying out the actions and murders ordered by the secret leadership, and the group of so-called "infiltrators" who are expected to supply information. The Members of Parliament, Kiesinger (CDU), Mende (FDP) and Hellwege (DP) belong to this group.

A terrorist organisation patterned on the notorious American Ku Klux Klan has thus been set up under the patronage of Adenauer and his pal Pferdmenges in West Germany, an organisation which it is intended to use against individual democrats and friends of peace.

Minister appeals to young terrorists

The spirit of these aims was expressed by the Bonn Minister in charge of sabotage and diversionist activities.

> "Federal Minister Jakob Kaiser appealed on February 4th, above all to young people in the Federal territory to place themselves at the disposal of a 'self-aid against Communism.' 'We must at last energetically oppose all Communist agitators and their helpers. The time has come to organise an effective self help against all Communist machinations in towns, villages and factories.'" ("Hamburger Echo", Februar 5th 1951.)

Government money for neo-fascist organisations

In October 1950 the KPD fraction in the Bonn Parliament put a question asking for information about the subsidy given by the Kaiser Ministry to the neo-fascist "Deutscher Bund". The questioner asked whether the Adenauer government was aware that the Deutscher Bund had received a credit to the amount of 50,000 marks from the "Westdeutscher Bankverein" for which the Kaiser Ministry had given the guarantee.

Legalised "Werwolves"

> "The 'Reichsjugend', newly founded organisation of the 'Deutsche Reichspartei' met for the first time in Flensburg on October 7th. Their uniform consists of a blue-grey shirt, similar to that worn by the former German air force, and black shorts. The leaders wear black breeches and jackboots.
>
> 'Reichsführer' Münchow, Chairman of the association, appeared with a silver oakleaf insignia on a golden field on his left arm, and the so-called 'wolf insignia' on a white ground on his right breast. The badges of rank were embroidered on black-white-red armlets." ("Frankfurter Rundschau", Frankfurt/Main, October 10th 1950.)

The "Brotherhood" — agents of the occupation powers in West Germany

"The "Brotherhood" which will be mentioned below in connection with remilitarisation should be referred to here in order to round off the picture which has included only some of the neo-fascist organisations in West Germany. The "Frankfurter Allgemeine" reported on April 9th, 1951, that the Chairmen of the "German Union", Baron von Stauffenberg, has made a number of statements about the "Brotherhood" which showed that this was a centre of West Allied agents. The "Brotherhood" had the task of "making possible the establishment of a political elite". The Baron was of the opinion that the situation in West Germany justified and allowed the existence of secret underground organisations. Above all the active Hitler Youth leaders and the "younger generation of officers had had to make up their minds to take false names". There were about 80,000 such persons among the young Germans. They were, however, "in connection with each other and form the reservoir of activist temperaments that can one day be set in motion".

The majority of those "living underground" were a "youthful political element". They possessed considerable technical and organisational qualifications which they had put at the disposal of the National Socialist state, the "technical exactitude and readiness for action of which" had to be emphasised. The majority of the "illegals" had already gone back to work. They were working together with those who had formerly been their ideological opponents. In conclusion Stauffenberg pointed out that "the men of the Brotherhood ... made use of their opportunities to support in their circles the necessity of a European union and to emphasise the idiocy of a German rearmament on a national basis" that is to say they were working for the formation of a West German mercenary army in the framework of the West European army.

Ex-servicemen's organisations

Apart from the many organisations of former officers and generals, big organisations have been set up for the ex-servicemen of Hitler's Wehrmacht in West Germany. These organisation are an attempt to hold available the largest possible reservoirs of manpower for the planned reintroduction of conscription. These organisations are built up on the pattern of the so-called "Front-line Soldier's Associations" of the Weimar Republic and are an expression of reborn nazism in West Germany.

At the end of February 1951 the semi-military organisation "Stahlhelm" was reconstituted in Frankfurt/Main with the "benevolent approval" of the West German Minister of the Interior, Dr. Lehr.

Since the beginning of April the attempts to unite the various ex-servicemen's associations have reached an active stage. The biggest German ex-servicemen's association, the BVD (Bund versorgungsberechtigter ehemaliger Wehrmachtsangehöriger: Federation of ex-servicemen with pension rights, Chairman Admiral Hansen, Kiel), has over 80,000 members. This organisation has amalgamated with the "Schutzbund ehemaliger deutscher Soldaten" (German ex-servicemen's protective association) which was formed in March 1951 and which at the foundation ceremony in Bavaria had 5,000 members. The Chairman is Lieutenant-General Krakau, holder of the Knight's Cross of the Iron Cross, and the Bavarian Chairman is Colonel Gümbel.

Armoured corps "Greater Germany"

As in the days of the Weimar Republic the numerous officers' and soldiers' societies hold regular public rallies, thus doing much to lay the psychological groundwork for remilitarisation in West Germany. At the beginning of June 1951 the members of the former Armoured Corps "Greater Germany" rallied in very provocative form in Kassel. The "Rhein-Neckar Zeitung", Heidelberg, reporting the meeting on June 17th 1951, stated:

> "The striking things at the rally were the rejection of the 'ohne-mich' (count us out) slogan, the pointed expression of support for the existing government and the clear withdrawal of support from the political activity of the former Major-General Remer, today a speaker for the Socialist Reichs Party, who is in point of fact a member of the former

tank corps 'Greater Germany'... Despite all this, many of the former soldiers find it difficult to accustom themselves to the forms of parliamentary democracy . . . Democracy for its part cannot get along without the active support of the many citizens who were formerly soldiers ... It is up to the soldiers too to serve the state in support of the system of liberty and law rather than to regard themselves as a class apart . . .

> The question arises very forcibly whether such soldiers' rallies as that of the tank corps 'Greater Germany' are necessary in our present state. One cannot yet foresee whither their path may lead them, and whether it might not give rise to a dangerous partition of the people in groups of special interests or ossified ideological blocs. At the moment a distinction must be made between those groups moved mainly by sheerly material motives or resentment, and those founded on military tradition. Interestingly enough it is from the latter that the rejection of the newly awakened boundless radicalism comes and also their pledge to serve the republic. The views expressed in Kassel showed that the former soldiers do not intend to allow themselves to be isolated in their associations or to take up a position of opposition to the state . . . Our state knows no classes, upper or lower strata, groups of interests, or special casts."

One significant thing at this rally was the declaration made by Lieutenant-General von Manteuffel, former leader of this Hitlerite tank corps: "We pledge our loyalty to the existing state." Manteuffel's connection with the neo-fascist "Brotherhood' and his association with Adenauer as one of his main military advisers are a clear proof that in the remilitarisation policy of the Bonn government there is no group to the right of Adenauer. The soldiers' associations support Adenauer, and Adenauer gives his help to the soldiers' associations.

The parachutists

The rally of former parachutists on June 28th and 29th 1951 in Brunswick was particularily provocative and alarming for West European countries too. The war criminals, General Student and General Ramcke, appeared at this rally. Student became notorious during the war by his terroristic actions as commander of Hitler's parachute troops on Crete. The Western powers have protected him from prosecution as a war criminal.

Ramcke, also a former general of Hitler's parachutists, was fortress commander in Brest and was responsible for sadistic terror among the civilian population. After he had been released by the French authorities in June 1951 he was greeted by representatives of the Bonn government when he reached the German frontier. The Bonn government is finding a post for him in which he will be called upon to perform "tasks of international and external security".

> The "Wiesbaden Kurier" of June 30th 1951, reported: "Responsible Bonn government circles hope that parachute general Ramcke will soon declare his readiness to help in building up the future German defence. Reliable information gathered by our correspondent indicates that Adenauer in particular is very interested in gaining Ramcke's cooperation. It is reported

that the Chancellor made a proposal to the general when he was last in Bonn. Military experts of Blank's office are reported to have asked Ramcke to draw up a memorandum on the possibilities of forming a German parachutist unit."

4. Laws on the nazi pattern

The Bonn convict law of July 9/10th 1951

On July 9th 1951, the KPD fraction in the Bonn Parliament called for the prohibition of all fascist and militarist organisations in West Germany. Deputy Hugo Paul, KPD, introducing the motion stated: "The fascist militarist groups and organisations which today are calling, under the leadership of the controlling imperialists, for a new war against the peoples of the East, are at the same time the sworn enemies of the working class and all real democrats. The German people are not willing to allow themselves to be driven into a new war by such elements."

The majority of the Bonn Parliament shelved this application.

On the same day a "lightning law" introduced by the Adenauer government was pushed through in great haste with the support of the government parties and the SPD against the opposition of the KPD. This "Gestapo" law swept away the remainder of those few basic rights ensured by the Bonn constitution and provided the juridicial basis for Adenauer's policy of war. The aim of this new terror law is to gag all forces in West Germany who are interested in the maintenance of peace.

The Social Democrats were the people who pushed through this "lightning law" which came into force on July 10th. A group of oppositional Social Democrats, "Social Democratic Action", published in May 1951, in Frankfurt, a declaration directed against the SPD deputy and member of the party leadership, Wehner, who had called for a "lightning law" to ban the collection of signatures for a plebiscite against remilitarisation. On July 9th the SPD deputy Dr. Arndt spoke in the name of the Legal Committee to give the reasons for this "convict law".

What does this law define as high treason and treason? To put it shortly all opinions and deeds which support the rights of the German people to self-determination, to the preservation of its character as a united nation, to an independent German national state, to a peaceful life of work and construction, and to the most elementary democratic rights.

Speaking in favour of the law the SPD deputy Dr. Arndt stated that those who had drafted it had followed "classical patterns" by extending the definition of high treason as defined in the Weimar Republic to include also preparations thereto. By referring to the "classical character" of the laws taken as pattern Dr. Arndt threw an interesting light on the Bonn state itself. These "classical patterns" were nothing more nor less than the nazi emergency regulations of February 4th 1933; the notorious emergency regulation "for the protection of people and state" of February 28th 1933; the nazi law of April 24th 1934, which revised paragraphs 80 to 93a of the Criminal Code; and the so-called "Heim-

tücke Gesetz" (treason law) of December 20th 1934, with the help of which the German fascists brought all friends of peace to the executioner's block, to the concentration camps and prisons, the law with the help of which Hitler fascism stifled the real voice of the German people in blood.

In this "convict" law there is an offence known as "endangering the state" punishable by five to fifteen years of hard labour. The Bonn state, which otherwise regards itself as so strong, finds itself in danger when "documents, phonographic records or pictures of a type dangerous to the state" are imported; when "news is gathered for a party or other associations outside the Federal Republic" (obviously above all in the German Democratic Republic); or when the Federal President, officials, the government, the parliament and the courts of the federal and provincial authorities or the members thereof are "slandered".

In addition people are threatened with hard labour sentences who commit "treason' by "being in connection with a government, party, other association or institution situated outside the territory in which this law is in force or having connection with a person who works for such a government, party, association or institution, doing this with the intent to undermine ... the Federal Republic or one of its constitutional principles."

That means quite briefly that anybody is ripe for jail who does not agree with the aggressive policy of the United States, with the partitioning of Germany, with the remilitarisation of West Germany, with the recurrent national treachery of Adenauer and Schumacher. Anybody who writes a letter to people in the German Democratic Republic about the fight for peace is a "traitor" for the men of Bonn. This "law" does not leave the citizens of the West German separatist state a single shred of legal protection.

Hamburg newspaper attacks Bonn convict law

The conservative Hamburg weekly "Die Zeit" stated on July 19th 1951:

> "Heavy punishments for libel can lead to a complete gagging of criticism because of the great risk. Since, however, criticism is a fundamental of democracy it can be seen what dangers the broadening of political penal law bringswith it."

The newspaper does not attempt to conceal the origin of the Bonn terror law:

> "The paragraph was, however, not invented by the Federal Parliament. It originated in spirit in an emergency regulation issued by President Hindenburg on December 8th 1931, supplemented by Hitler's Heimtücke Gesetz of 1934."

Coburg "Neue Presse" on the convict law

The Coburg "Neue Presse" stated on July 14th 1951:

> "Glancing through the penal clauses which in some parts have been completely revised one sees at once that the protection of the state as such is the main consideration, while the defence of democracy with its rights of liberty for all citizens is well in the background.

It is impossible to avoid seeing that the whole procedure has a devilish resemblance to nazi law-making which under the general title of 'endangering the state' issued the regulation for the protection of people and state (February 1933), the law against the formation of new parties (July 1933), the law for the preservation of order (October 1933) and the Heimtücke Gesetz (December 1934).

All these laws had the specific aim of protecting Hitler's dictatorship from every democratic movement.

One might have expected that at least the right of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, both of which are constitutional rights of every democratic citizen provided for in the Bonn Basic Law, would have been declared inviolable. This is, however, not the case.

The expression 'secrets of state' often used in the new regulation will have particularly far reaching effects in the future.

When in addition the provision of particular measures to protect honour and secrecy is based on the fact that the Federal Republic needs stronger laws against its enemies than the Weimar Republic, and if that is supposed to mean that the Weimar Republic perished only because it had not enough laws, then we must protest in the name of historic truth. It ill befits those who once tamely rendered up to Hitler all the emergency regulations necessary to strangle democracy, now to shed crocodiles' tears over the juridicial weakness of the Weimar Republic.

Attention must be drawn to a legal oddity which sums up the entire German tragedy. For the first time in the German penal code the term 'treason' is used to describe an internal German crime. It appears to us that in view of the extremely elastic nature of the paragraphs on treason every peaceful effort towards German unity is endangered if it finds expression in legal conversation with East Germans.

Has what the preamble of the Bonn Basic Law of May 23rd 1949 guaranteed and promised already been forgotten? This preamble speaks of the 'will' which 'fills' the lawmaker to protect the unity of nation and state. The preamble states definitely: 'The entire German people is called upon to complete the unity and liberty of Germany in free self-determination.' Has this sentence been blotted out in favour of a penal clause?"

Censorship regulation endanger political liberty

Other bourgeois newspapers in West Germany have also criticised the Bonn convict law. The "Stuttgarter Nachrichten" of July 12th 1951 dealt with the "lightning law" for the suppression of democracy in West Germany. The paper admitted that "the censorship paragraph of the new law endangers the measure of freedom in political life and in the press guaranteed by the Basic Law".

The history of the Gestapo law

The Gestapo law passed by the Bonn Parliament on July 9/10th 1951 was preceded by the emergency law of September 19th 1950 which provided the

grounds for expelling the members of the following organisations from public office:

> "The organisations the support of which cannot be reconciled with the civil service regulations include the following:
>
> (1) Communist Party of Germany and all its subsidiary organisations
> (2) Social Democratic Action
> (3) Free German Youth (FDJ)
> (4) The Association of Friends of the Soviet Union
> (5) The Society for the Study of the Culture of the Soviet Union
> (6) The League of Culture for the democratic renewal of Germany
> (7) All-German Group for Agriculture and Forestry
> (8) Committee of Fighters for Peace
> (9) Committee of young Fighters for Peace
> (10) The Association of Victims of Nazism (VVN)
> (11) Socialist Reichs Party
> (12) The so-called 'Black Front' (Otto Strasser movement)
> (13) National Front
>
> The Federal Government requests superior officials to take the necessary measures against officials, employees and workers who infringe upon their loyalty to the Federal Republic by belonging to such organisations. Those guilty are to be removed immediately and without fail from federal service. Permanent officials will be suspended without pay while proceedings against them are being instituted. Temporary officials will be given immediate notice. Employees and workers will be dismissed without notice.
>
> The Federal Government recommends the provincial governments to take similar measures immediately."
>
> (Quoted from the announcement made by the Bonn Ministry of the Interior.)

The organisations named (11) and (12) are insignificant fascist groups. All the others are progressive organisations which fight against American war and for peace and German unity.

At the beginning of February 1951 it became known that the Bonn Ministry of Justice had prepared an emergency law entitled "High treason law" intended to be used to suppress the growing movement against the remilitarisation of West Germany. Members of the Parliamentary Commitee consulted on the draft of this law gave news of it in Bonn on February 3rd. Ministers Lehr and Seebohm are said to be the initiators of this new emergency law patterned on fascist laws.

These two Ministers together with Jakob Kaiser were commissioned by representatives of the American High Commission to work out such a law immediately after the Eisenhower talks in Homburg. A special section of the West German Supreme Court is to be set up for the prosecution of all cases which fall under this new emergency law.

The emergency law of September 1950 was extended by the following measure which represented a step towards the Gestapo law of July 9/10th 1951:

> "The Federal Government has issued a sharp warning to business enterprises that they should not support seditious organisations in any

form. Firms which after this warning extend help to anti-constitutional organisations by means of contributions, advertisements or in any other way will no longer, in accordance with a cabinet decision, be considered in the distribution of government contracts." ("Die Welt', March 28th 1951.)

This decree from the Bonn Federal Government had been planned for a long time. The "Berliner Wirtschaftsblatt", of August 25th 1950, published the following answer given by Jakob Kaiser to a letter which had been sent to the newspaper:

> "Dear Herr de Haas,
> In your open letter published in the 'Berliner Wirtschaftsblatt' on August 18th 1950 you ask me what I think should be done to firms which continuously advertise in Communist newspapers in West Germany. You have answered your question yourself in your open letter: they should be publicly pilloried and exposed to national infamy ... The proper authorities will decide when and if the KPD should lose its permit as a political party ...
>
> We closely watch East-West trade from a sense of responsibility for the whole of Germany and also in the interest of the Federal Republic ... I deeply regret that there appears to be no Western solidarity in the question of trade with the east. The East uses the trade as an effective weapon against the West and has only one aim: to become strong itself in order to weaken the West economically wherever possible ..."

Waves of terror against the Communist Party — ban on the Council of the VVN

In the middle of Juli 1951 newspapers reported that the Bonn Ministry of the Interior was preparing a new wave of terror against all democratic organisations in West Germany. Members of the Ministry of the Interior were preparing for a ban on the KPD in breach of the Bonn Basic Law. According to the same reports the activities of the Association of the Victims of Nazism (VVN) and other democratic organisations would not be tolerated in West Germany much longer.

The correctness of this report was confirmed by the fact that on July 29th 1951 the Adenauer government banned the Council of the VVN. Thus the organisation of the victims of fascism in West Germany became one of the first victims of neo-fascism. The introduction of conscription is intended to be coupled with the banning of the KPD and other really democratic organisations. Such a ban has been forecast by the numerous prohibitions of meetings and demonstrations, the sackings from the public service, the endess chain of bans on Communist newspapers and the sealing of their printshops, the convict law of 9/10th July 1951 and the prohibition of the Council of the VVN. In all these acts Social Democratic leaders have served as dishonourable informers and lackeys of reaction. They play the same role as Severing in the Weimar Republic who helped to prepare the way for the nazis by his bans on left-wing organisations. The Social Democratic "Hamburger Echo" reported on December 3rd 1950: "The Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for all-German affairs, Wehner, SPD, expressed his regret that no public prosecutor in the

Federal Republic had yet taken the steps expected against Max Reimann, Chairman of the KPD." Wehner is notorious as a renegade who was expelled from the KPD many years ago for betraying his comrades to the Gestapo where certain death awaited them.

It has been impossible to give a full picture of the internal policy of the West German separatist state in this chapter. It was only intended to prove that the policy followed by the Bonn government had no other aim but war. For this purpose it was installed in office by American and British imperialism. By its servility to these imperialisms the German imperialists and militarists hope to become a great power again. The material quoted in this chapter in support of the charges made at the beginning is only a small part of that which could have been quoted. It is sufficient, however, in order to make clear that no distinction can be made between the German policy of American and British imperialism and the policy of the Adenauer government. In addition it has been shown that the Bonn war republic and the policy of its government, camouflaged behind the Wall Street version of "democracy and liberty" is leading West Germany to war and destruction. This becomes quite obvious when the stage reached by remilitarisation in West Germany is investigated.

V.

WEST GERMANY AS RECRUITING TERRITORY, MANOEUVRE GROUND AND MILITARY BASE FOR AMERICAN WAR

1. West Germany's position in American strategic plans 111
What the warmongers plan for the people in West Germany 111 / Western powers remilitarise West Germany contrary to international agreements 112 / Atlantic war bloc plans of aggression camouflaged as defence 113 / Truman confirms Stalin's reasoning 113 / Truman's cynicism 115 / West Europe's war potential in Eisenhower's plan 116 / Eisenhower's "division of labour" 117 / The Western powers' strategic plans for the European campaign 118 / A German "stooge" has his doubts 119 / The atom bomb strategists of the imperialists 120

2. Germany—main theatre of war 121
American war plans for battles in Germany 121 / Plans to turn Upper Rhine Valley into a swamp 123 / Preparations to blow up bridges and tunnels 124 / The zone of death between Rhine and Elbe 126 / Number of airfields in West Germany increased 127 / Manoevre grounds and firing ranges in West Germany for American war 128 / Social Democrat Schumacher adopts Goebbels' suicidal strategy 129

3. German mercenaries as "suicide squads" for the American war 132
A glance at history 132 / Not our boys 133 / Eisenhower does not want Hessian mercenaries 134 / Diplomatic fencing on remilitarisation 135 / American invasion to support remilitarisation 137

4. Creating the "psychological conditions" 139
Eisenhower rehabilitates German "soldierly honour" 139 / Amnesty for nazi war criminals—preparation for American war 140 / "Ending the state of war"—no peace treaty 143

5. The German General Staff at work 144
The general staff—the root and the driving force of revived German militarism 144 / Halder and Guderian—two of Hitler's general staff chiefs in US pay 145 / Theodor Blank and the "Sicherheitsamt" 147 / Count Schwerin—nazi general and international agent 148 / Speidel and Co., Ltd. 149 / Minister Spiecker 149 / The Papal Nuncio in Bonn 151 / The "Brotherhood" once again 151

6. The German shocktroops—the lost contingent in the American war . . . 153
The negotiations between Bonn and the Western powers 153 / The organisational stage reached by remilitarisation 156 / Police as cadre organisation for a mass army 158 / "Labour Units"—a camouflaged army 161 / Naval rearmament 162 / Civil Defence and security zones 163

1. West Germany's position in American stratetic plans

What the warmongers plan for the people in West Germany

West Germany has been given a position of first rate importance in the military plans of the American atom bomb strategists. It is the recruiting territory, the manoeuvre ground and the military base for American war. Apart from the important war economic potential of West Germany it is above all a reservoir of manpower, which the strategists of Wall Street want to use in their plans for aggression against the German Democratic Republic, the People's Democracies and the Socialist Soviet Union. The great numbers of skilled workers available are valuable both for the arms industry and for a big army equipped with all modern weapons such as is being prepared in West Germany. The purely technical organisation of the manpower of West Germany in military formations and their equipment are relatively simple problems for the American warmongers and their German puppets.

The main trouble for the American atom bomb strategists is the ideological integration, particularly of the working population of West Germany, in the war camp of dollar imperialism. That is why the question of war aims plays a decisive role in the preparations for imperialist aggression. The question asked by the man in the street is "Why should I fight and for whom?" An answer must be given to the question of why there should be war. For the internationally interwoven monopoly capitalists, including the German, the common war aim, despite all the continued differences between them is: Crusade against the East; Annihilation of Socialism. The masses of the people are expected to pay with their blood for a third world war planned with this aim. The experiences of all imperialist invasions of the Soviet Union have proved that war against the Soviet Union is not a war aim which can tempt them. It does not tempt the Germans either, who in the course of one generation have had to bear the burdens and sacrifices of two lost imperialist wars. Eisenhower's intention to use the Germans as a "cutting edge" for the Atlantic pact war powers led by him against the East, would mean the certain destruction of the Germans as a nation and the complete devastation of their territory. That may be a war aim for murderers and suicides but not for a great nation. The imperialist war mongers are unable to find any war aim "tempting" for the people. They therefore use lying propaganda and terror like Goebbels and Hitler before them, in order to defraud and mislead the peoples and to press-gang them for imperialist predatory war. That is why the Wall Street strategists are so liberal with political and economic "concessions" to those holding power in the Bonn separatist state. These "concessions" will be more far reaching than hitherto following the defeats suffered by the war mongers in the elections in Italy and France. These defeats have greatly raised the specific weight of the West German war potential for the American atom bomb strategists.

The remilitarisation of West Germany is keeping step with the *reconstruction of German militarism*. The reconstruction of German militarism means a new foundation, which the Schuman Plan has laid, for German imperialism both politically and economically. The economic ascent of German imperialism strengthens the political and vice versa. The restoration of German imperialism and militarism is the great danger for the security of the peace-loving peoples of

Europe and for the existence of Germany as a nation. This is why the reestablishment of German imperialism and militarism is such an appalling crime on the part of the American imperialists and their European puppets. This is why the puppet government of the West German separatist state, including the nationalist-militarist forces of German origin and the "opposition" of Schumacher, who all dance to the American tune, have committed such unheard-of national treachery.

Western powers remilitarise West Germany contrary to international agreements

Towards the end of the Second World War the representatives of the three great Allied powers, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, made a formal declaration on the destruction of German militarism and National Socialism at the Yalta conference in the Crimea from February 3rd to February 11th 1945. The declaration stated:

> "It is our inflexible purpose to destroy German militarism and Nazism and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world. We are determined to disarm and disband all German armed forces, break up for all time the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production; bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment."

The Potsdam Agreement of August 2nd 1945 signed by Stalin, Truman and Attlee based itself expressly on the Yalta Declaration:

> "The purpose of this agreement it to carry out the Crimea Declaration on Germany. German militarism and Nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbours or the peace of the world."

France later announced her adherence to this solemn agreement made by the three great powers who had been allied in the war against Hitler fascism.

The Western powers have ignored this international agreement signed by their leading statesmen. For years they have been going ahead with the remilitarisation of West Germany, reconstructing German militarism in the territory of the West German separatist state with the help of the same generals and officers who played a leading part in organising the Wehrmacht and in Hitler's criminal war. Hitler prepared for his criminal war by the cynical breach of international agreements and treaties. On this point too the Western powers show themselves to be the willing pupils of Hitler, for whom international treaties which he signed were only worthless scraps of paper.

The Western powers realise that their policy of aggression is particularly incriminated by the fact that they have broken agreements which were established to preserve peace from one of the most dangerous aggressors of modern history. They show this by hypocritically basing their perfidious actions on the Yalta and Potsdam agreements which they have completely reversed by their deeds.

Atlantic war bloc plans of aggression camouflaged as defence

The war aims of the Atlantic war bloc set up and directed by American monopoly capital are the liquidation of the democratic order in the Eastern part of Germany, the European People s Democracies and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. The "minimum" war aim is a decisive weakening and isolation of the Socialist Soviet Union. The establishment of world domination by American imperialism is regarded as the final aim of the Third World War which it is planning.

These aims are not new. Under more favourable circumstances Hitler wanted to subjugate Europe and destroy the Soviet Union as the first step towards the domination of the world by German imperialism. It is well known how this criminal assault, and the criminal himself, ended.

The camouflaging of the aggressive plans of the Atlantic war bloc as a defence plan to "save civilisation from Bolshevism" is not new; it is a stale recipe from propaganda boss Goebbels witches' cauldron. This "slogan to cover everything" has been used by the imperialist warmongers for more than 30 years. For the remilitarisation of West Germany, however, it has a quite specific importance and must therefore be mentioned in this connection. The poison spread by Hitlerite propaganda lies about the Soviet Union is deeply embedded in the brains of large sections of the population in West Germany. The Hitler state was the most successful of all imperialist states in the measure to which it was able to poison its people ideologically, and this degree of poisoning will never be reached again. Since the total defeat of the Hitler state there has been scarcely any interruption in this ideological poisoning of the West German population. From Schumacher to the released nazi war criminals they all use the anti-bolshevist scare. This is the breeding ground for "revisionism' and thoughts of revenge, and the remilitarisation which is being carried out for their realisation.

Ku Klux Klan man Truman naturally also uses this "defence" phraseology to cloak American aggression, and sets himself up as the standard bearer of a crusade to "save civilisation from Bolshevism". On April 14th 1951 for instance he held a warmongering speech in Washington on Jefferson-Jackson Day in which he stated:

> "We decided to defend Korea... our men are fighting in Korea in order to save us from having to fight on our own soil. They are fighting in order to prevent the losses and sacrifices of a third world war.' ("New York Times", April 15th 1951)

Since the days of Hitler there has been no more glaring example of blatant lies used to convert an imperialist aggression into defence. In the same speech Truman boasted of the enormous armaments of the United States.

Truman confirms Stalin's reasoning

Truman's war speech confirmed Stalin's reasoning with regard to another leading warmonger, the British Prime Minister Attlee, one of the men who signed the Potsdam Agreement. In February 1951 a correspondent of "Pravda" asked Stalin:

"What is your estimate of British Prime Minister Attlee's latest statement in the House of Commons that the Soviet Union has not disarmed since the end of the war, that is to say has not demobilised her troops, that the Soviet Union is further increasing her armed forces?"

Stalin's reply to this question is given here in full since it gave the answer in advance to Truman's war speech and all the other standard speeches of the imperialist warmongers, already held and those still to come, all these standard speeches borrowed from Goebbel's repertoire. Stalin said:

"I regard this statement by Prime Minister Attlee as a slander on the Soviet Union. The whole world knows that the Soviet Union demobilised her troops after the war. As is well known the demobilisation was carried out in three phases: the first and second phases were carried out in 1945 and the third phase lasted from May to September 1946. In addition a demobilisation of the older age-groups of the personnel of the Soviet army was carried out in the years 1946 and 1947. At the end of 1948 all remaining older age groups were demobilised. I f P r i m e M i n i s t e r A t t l e e r e a l l y k n e w s o m e t h i n g a b o u t f i n a n c i a l a n d e c o n o m i c s c i e n c e s h e w o u l d u n d e r s t a n d w i t h o u t d i f f i c u l t y t h a t n o s i n g l e s t a t e, n o t e x c l u d i n g t h e S o v i e t U n i o n, c a n d e v e l o p i t s p e a c e i n d u s t r y t o t h e f u l l e x t e n t; c a n b e g i n g r e a t c o n s t r u c t i o n p r o j e c t s l i k e t h e h y d r o - e l e c t r i c s t a t i o n s o n t h e V o l g a, t h e D n i e p r a n d t h e A m u - D a r i a w h i c h d e m a n d s t a t e e x - p e n d i t u r e a m o u n t i n g t o t h o u s a n d s o f m i l l i o n s; c a n c o n t i n u e i t s p o l i c y o f s y s t e m a t i c a l l y l o w e r i n g t h e p r i c e s o f a r t i c l e s o f m a s s c o n s u m p t i o n w h i c h a l s o d e m a n d s d o z e n s o f t h o u s a n d s o f m i l l i o n s; c a n d e v o t e h u n d r e d s o f t h o u s a n d s o f m i l l i o n s t o r e b u i l d i n g t h e e c o n o m y d e s t r o y e d b y t h e G e r m a n o c c u p a n t s, a n d a t t h e s a m e t i m e i n c r e a s e i t s a r m e d f o r c e s a n d e x p a n d i t s w a r i n d u s t r y. (Our emphasis, ed.) It is not difficult to grasp that such an unwise policy would lead to the bankruptcy of the state. Prime Minister Attlee ought to know from his own experience and from the experience of the USA that multiplication of the armed forces of a country and that the armaments race leads to an expansion of war industry, limitation of peace industry, the suspension of large civilian construction plans, to rising taxation and to rising prices for articles of mass consumption. If the Soviet Union does not limit peace industry but on the contrary expands it, if she does not suspend the construction of great new hydro-electric stations and irrigation systems but on the contrary expands them, if she does not suspend the policy of lowering prices but on the contrary continues it, it is obvious that she cannot at the same time inflate her war industry and increase her armed forces without thereby running the risk of going bankrupt.

And if Prime Minister Attlee, despite all these facts and scientific considerations, still thinks it is possible openly to slander the Soviet Union and her peaceful policy, that can only be explained by the fact that he expects to justify the arms race at present being carried out by the

Labour government in Britain by means of slanders against the Soviet Union.

Prime Minister Attlee needs the lies about the Soviet Union, he has to represent the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union as an aggressive one, and the aggressive policy of the British government as a peaceful policy, in order to mislead the British people, to impose this lie about the Soviet Union on the British people and by this means to drag them by fraud into a new world war which is being organised by the ruling circles of the USA.

Prime Minister Attlee claims to be a supporter of peace. If he is really for peace why did he decline the proposal made by the Soviet Union in the organisation of the United Nations about the immediate conclusion of a peace pact between the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States of America, China and France? If he is really in favour of peace why did he decline the proposals of the Soviet Union for immediate limitation of armaments and an immediate ban on atomic weapons?

If he is really in favour of peace why does he persecute those who work for the defense of peace, why did he ban the Peace Congress in Great Britain? Could perhaps the campaign for the defence of peace threaten the security of Great Britain?

It is clear that Prime Minister Attlee is not in favour of the maintenance of peace but for the unleashing of a new world-wide war of aggression."

Truman's cynicism

The Anglo-American warmongers add cynicism to their lies and unscrupulous acts. The reconstruction of German militarism in West Germany cancels out a decisive result of the Allied victory—the destruction of German militarism, notorious peace breaker and scourge of the German people. American monopoly capital now wants to use this scourge against the peace-loving peoples. This is the reason why the Western powers are rebuilding German militarism in West Germany. From this it may be seen that American imperialism is the main enemy of peace. President Harry S. Truman, one of the signatories of the Potsdam Agreement, heads the political executive of American imperialism. As has already been shown, he is one of the most cynical spokesmen of the American war party. The degree of his cynicism in regard to war may be seen from the statement which he made in June 1941, and which he has not withdrawn up to the present day. He made this statement on the day after the Hitler's criminal attack of the Soviet Union as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee in Washington:

> "If we see that Germany is winning we should help Russia and if Russia is winning we should help Germany so that in this way they kill off as many of each other as possible." ("New York Times", June 23rd 1941)

It is well worth noting this barbaric line of thought of American profiteers that other peoples should mutually slaughter each other so that American monopoly capital can control them more easily. This is a line of reasoning which can be seen time and time again. It ought to make people realise that those

persons of German origin who ally themselves with American imperialism have made a pact with the assassins of the German nation and have become their henchmen.

West Europe's war potential in Eisenhower's plans

General Eisenhower has revealed with brutal frankness how he intends to develop the general line of the United States policy as laid down by Truman in the speech quoted above. This general line is to drive other peoples into war, to keep one's own forces in the background, to make great profits by supplying armaments and finally to found the world domination of American monopoly capital on the backs of the nations which have been bled white by war.

On February 1st 1951, General Eisenhower, Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic Pact forces, informed the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington about some conclusions which he had drawn from his journey to the capitals of the Atlantic Pact nations. At the beginning of his speech Eisenhower warned his listeners, the members of the legislative bodies: "From time to time *in the near future you will be obliged to make decisions of very great import.* I believe that these decisions may decide the course of our civilisation..." Eisenhower naturally denied the aggressive character of the war potential build up the United States, describing it as "a wall of peace and security round the United States". Anything else was simply malicious rumour spread by foreign propaganda. He then proceeded to answer the question as to *what importance West Europe had from the point of view of the welfare of the United States.*

Eisenhower stated that the basic importance of the Atlantic Pact organisation consisted in the following facts:

> "First: West Europe possesses the greatest concentration of skilled workers in the world. West Europe has a great industrial capacity only exceeded by the capacity of the United States. More than 200 million of our kin live in West Europe...
>
> If we allow this entire complex with its potentialities for military training to be transferred from the American side to another side I believe that military equilibrium would be so disturbed that our security would be seriously endangered. The importance of this European group of nations is, however, still greater... They are closely connected by blood and by political and economic factors with many parts of the world. It is scarcely possible to imagine that West Europe should fall to Communism without at the same time certain great areas, especially those politically dependent on the European powers, also falling to Communism. This would mean that we would in a short time be cut off from areas from which we draw materials absolutely necessary for our existence and the American way of life. Whether or not we are strong enough to maintain the lines of communications to these territories, we have to hold them open, we need their trade. Take for example manganese, copper and uranium. Is it possible to imagine that we can exist without access to these things?"
> ("New York Times", February 2nd 1951.)

Eisenhower's "division of labour"

Eisenhower thus claims nothing more nor less than the wealth of the West European states and their colonies in raw materials, industrial capacity, manpower and cannon fodder as indispensable for the well-being of the United States and for the preservation of the "American way of life". These things above all, according to Eisenhower, connect the United States with the West European group of states and must be "defended". The United States could not do this by herself but she wants to help and accordingly distributes her forces all over the world. Eisenhower has planned the "division of labour" according to the principle that the United States should get the profits and her allies should bear the sacrifices. He is counting on the man power reserves of West Europe and the North American Continent, which together total some 350 million people who "represent the highest culture and possess a great untouched reservoir of leaders". Eisenhower appeals here to the "theory of the master race" used by all imperialist states. The leading position in the pact with the West European states is, however, naturally occupied by the USA. In this connection Eisenhower stated:

> "Which nation is more capable and better prepared to merit the leadership than the USA? We have been spared the disappointments, the defeatism, the destruction which have visited Europe. We are younger, more fresh and, a very important point, we are further away from the area of immediate danger. We are not living in the gray zone . . .
>
> This force . . . must grow in the rear and spread out from there. I do not mean that we should scatter our units round the world as fast as we establish them. I mean the financial, moral, material and military forces which are being produced. Our friends . . . must produce more of these things than they need in their own territory because we from a central point must observe the development in many sectors. We cannot concentrate all our forces in one sector, not even when it is so important as Western Europe. We have to keep a great mobile reserve here (in the USA, ed.) ready to support our policy, our rights and our interests in any part of the world in which they are endangered."

That is the clearest possible expression of the Wall Street strategy as it affects American monopoly capital and its West European vassals. In order to cheer up American arms kings Eisenhower added that West Europe had great need of munitions, weapons and equipment which would have to be supplied by the United States. In this connection Eisenhower stated:

> "I must emphasise that at this moment the West European complex is so important for our future that we cannot afford to do less than our very best to stop deterioration there. I repeat that one factor, time, is lost if we have to produce the morale . . . We must make sure that Europe is ready in heart and mind. That is one of the tasks which rests upon the shoulders of myself and my staff . . . In any case I believe that the United States need a far far stronger information service. In our case I do not want to call it propaganda."

Eisenhower's statement has been quoted at considerable length. The people of Western Europe and the West German population cannot learn from a more authentic source than from the mouth of the Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic Pact forces the role planned for them by their treacherous statesmen and politicians who serve American monopoly capital.

The Western powers' strategic plans for the European campaign

The strategic plan of the Atlantic bloc war leadership must be considered in connection with Eisenhower's plans for the use of West European war potential. On April 2nd 1951 General Eisenhower officially took over the command of the Atlantic pact forces. In an order of the day he announced that his provisional headquarters in Paris had been converted from a planning staff to an operational staff. His advance headquarters are at Heidelberg. An active stage has been reached in the preparations for the aggression planned by the United States.

The strategic plans of the Atlantic war bloc for the European campaign are based on the drafts of German experts, Nazi Field Marshalls and General Staff Officers who are experienced in defeat, men with "experience on the Russian front" as Wall Street demanded. These modern mercenaries, the Syngman Rhees from the Rhine who sell their fatherland as well as their "experiences in Eastern front war", men who never had a conscience and who are ready to drum up Germans for the mass graves for a good round sum of dollars, these men like Halder, Guderian, Speidel, Heusinger etc. are very valuable to the American warmongers.

These German defeat specialists try to excuse their past defeats by saying that Hitler ruined their plans, that he did not end the war when defeat was inevitable and thus save the army, even in a weakened state, for a new war of revenge to be started later. They direct their main reproach against the Western powers, however, for landing in West Europe, attacking Hitler from the rear and thus preventing the defeat of the Soviet Union. This is the "Ersatz" for the "stab in the back" legend. After the defeat in 1918 the German militarists spread the legend that the "enemy from within" had stabbed the "brave soldiers undefeated at the front" in the back. And after their defeat in the Second World War they blamed partly Hitler's amateur strategy and partly the Allied attack in Western Europe for the total defeat which followed total war. The reason for this creation of legends is to reburnish the rusty shield of German military leadership so that it can be used for a third world war. Now they are talking their American-British masters into using their "revised" plans of campaign against the East. German monopoly capital has been replaced as boss by Anglo-American monopoly capital, using the German as its junior partner. This fact, according to the calculations of the German defeat strategists and their boss Eisenhower, will make it possible to use the strong industrial potentialities of Western Europe and North America against the East. They want to establish an army amply equipped with all modern weapons from this manpower reservoir 350 million strong. The strategists of the Atlantic Bloc, particularly the former Hitler strategists, regard it as their trump card that they think they will not be exposed to the fatal situation of having to fight a war on two fronts.

About three miles above the village the Friedrichstal bridge arches high above the river Wied. The fresh concrete of the closed demolition chambers stands out clearly against the darker masonry. The mayor shrugs his shoulders with a gesture of resignation: 'We can't do anything about it, officially it's all part of the drainage system.' But the entire population down to the smallest child knows what is really going on.

The journey continues up the next valley. The mountains push together and the river Sayn gurgles beside the road. A little over a mile from Isenburg a bridge crosses the river. On both sides four further demolition chambers may be seen. Although this bridge has stood up to the storms of five centuries its massive rocky foundation must have given the engineer responsible for the demolition preparation a severe headache. In order to make quite sure he has had borings fifteen feet deep made into the foundations on both sides. On seeing a camera the foreman responsible forbids in a shocked voice any photographs being taken. 'This is a military zone. You can't do that here', he says, followed by a long explanation. Another boring will be made in the foundations parallel to the river banks from these 15 ft deep borings and then three further demolition chambers will be broken out on each side pointing to the apex of the bridge. That means that altogether fourteen demolition chambers are being prepared, probably enough to deal with this 500 year old bridge.

About a hundred feet away four families totalling 22 persons live on a farm called rather significantly 'Lachnit' (Laugh not) mill. These people, some of whom were bombed out during the war, really do not feel like laughing since the 14 demolition chambers, if they go off, would be sufficient to blow them and their rather rickety house to atoms.

The car climbs on through the mountains, up the steep path leading from the little town of Sayn to Stromberg. Round the corner are seven more demolition chambers which according to local inhabitants are 24 ft deep. A quick look round—the road is empty—and with a crowbar the heavy manhole cover is lifted. The hole goes straight down many feet into the rock. There is water 14 ft down and at 15 ft we run out of string. The Communists, the night before, had decorated the road and the cliffs with inscriptions yards high 'American soldiers homeward bound—the Loreley still stands its ground' and 'Away with the demolition chambers, fight for our united homeland'."

Preparations to blow up bridges and tunnels

On the entire territory of the West German separatist state preparations are being made to blow up bridges and railway tunnels, since the American headquarter in Heidelberg have supreme military command of the whole area. A large number of reports on these preparations have been made in the West German press. Here is a selection of them:

The "Schwäbische Landeszeitung", Augsburg, reported on February 16th 1951:

"Several bridges across the Main have been fitted out with demolition chambers on the orders of the American army. According to information received by us it was originally intended to prepare demolition chambers in only five of the Main bridges. Since then, however, the preparations

the American High Commissioner McCloy not to "underestimate" the threat from the East. He wrote that he had seen from the press that former General Geyr von Schweppenburg had advised McCloy not to overestimate the Russian danger, quoting the successes won by a German corps of Guderian's army in 1941 between Brest-Litovsk and Moscow. This corps, consisting of three armoured divisions, had in this period destroyed a great number of Russian divisions. Mahlmann stated in his letter that he could not agree with von Schweppenburg in his underestimation of the Russian danger. In his reasoning Schweppenburg had omitted to mention the fact that shortly afterwards, in the winter 1941/1942, a hundred and fifty new Russian divisions appeared to replace the fifty which had been destroyed. Today the Soviet Union was in a position to "regrow hydra's heads" immediately, since she had built up her arms industry to a degree which could keep up a continous stream of equipment for new divisions. "As for my own part," Mahlmann wrote, "I was on the Russian front for a long period as Regimental and Divisional Commander. On the basis of my experiences I should like to suggest that Herr von Schweppenburg's opinion be regarded as a misjudgement."

The tone of the letter and its publication by the DPA accords with the policy of the Atlantic War bloc to describe aggression as defence. (It is interesting to note that Mahlmann, since March 15th, 1951, has occupied a post in "Labour company" headquarters in American army headquarters at Heidelberg.

The atom bomb strategists of the imperialists

One of the main elements of the "strategy of lightning war" is the "surprise attack" prepared for a long period and carried out with the greatest possible concentration of technical force. Only an aggressor uses the "lightning war strategy". It is a characteristic product and method of imperialist aggression which springs from the gangster morality of imperialism. Only a robber prepares an assault. The "strategy of lightning war" reveals uncertainty of victory since those who initiate it know that their cause is unjust and against the interests of the peoples and will never enjoy their support over a long period. That is why lightning wars have never been more than temporary successes; they always ended in the certain defeat of the aggressors. The strategists of American war have not the intelligence to see this fact, which is based on historic experience and a sober appreciation of the international balance of power. Although they like to pretend to be cool calculators they are really nothing more than criminal lunatics. When their plans go astray because they can only estimate social forces with the brains of a greedy miser and a brutal gangster, they put their faith in "superweapons", "secret weapons", and large scale extermination of nations through chemical weapons, made by Standard Oil and IG Farben.

The gangster strategists of American and British imperialism have been preparing for years to use atomic weapons on a very big scale. They have erected a circle of naval and air bases round the Asiatic-European Continents, including the Arctic. These are the bases for attack to which arms, munition and cannon fodder for American war will be transported and from which it is intended to send out atom bombs and other "superweapons" to destroy the main concentrations of life of the peoples of Asie and Europe. American magazines and newspapers print boastful maps of the Far East, the Mediterranean and the Arctic

showing the distribution of American bases, meaning bases for attack. Eisenhower, in his speech on February 1st, 1951, quoted above, gloried in the "greatest cleverness" of the USA in making sure of domination of the sea and air. This bragging is part of the psychological preparation of the American people for world aggression; they want to give the American people a feeling of superiority and a belief in certain success. The reactionary British newspaper "Daily Express" also published a map of Anglo-American bases in Spring 1951. The French newspaper "Ce Soir" published on April 20th, 1951, a map showing that the United States had 29 bases in France alone.

In the American theatre of war in Europe the destruction-mad atom bomb strategists plan to support the lightning war against the East by laying a "death zone" through the Western part of the Soviet Union. They want to create this death zone roughly along the "traditional Russian defence line" from the Black Sea to the Baltic by dropping atom bombs. There are similar plans for the line of the Rhine. Particularily importance should, therefore, be attached to a report appearing on March 29th, 1951, in "Die Welt", organ of the British occupation authorities, which stated:

> "*Eisenhower favours using atom bomb*
>
> A portion of the minutes of the secret sitting of the Senate Committee in which General Eisenhower was examined on the pros and cons of the defence of Europe and the Western world was recently published. Much may be learnt from this document. A typical remark made by the general was that the use of the atomic bomb in a future war of defence would depend exclusively on a consideration of the destruction it would cause as against the strategic advantages thereby achieved. '*If I should find the net profit was on my side then I should immediately use the atom bomb*' *Eisenhower declared.*"

The aggressor's standard lie that they only want to wage defensive war is constantly repeated in their propaganda. This makes it possible to see that the aggressors have no particular faith in the success of their "lightning war strategy". Their plans too betray the fact that they expect big reverses.

2. Germany — main theatre of war

American war plans for battles in Germany

Germany is intended to be the main theatre of war for the American war in Europe. The wreckers of Germany prove this by their military plans and their military preparations. Senator Robert Taft, leading representative of the Republican Party, a hard-boiled reactionary, mentioned the consequences which these plans would have for Germany in a speech he held on January 21st 1951, over the National Broadcasting Corporation, the biggest American radio network. The "Stuttgarter Zeitung", of January 23rd, 1951, reported his speech as follows:

> "*The attempt of the Western powers to raise large ground forces in Europe would mean to conjure up the destruction of Europe. The Germans knew that stationing a large army in Europe 'would mean the destruction*

of their country' since Germany would become the battle field in a new war. On these grounds alone the Germans would not desire rearmament."

Senator Taft's statement has a firm basis. The Swiss Councillor of State, Gottlieb Duttweiler, who returned home at the beginning of 1951 from an informatory trip to the United States, gave some information about the strategic plan of the United States for the "defence of West Europe" which through the indiscretion of Swiss circles was published in the Italian press. The "Schwäbische Landeszeitung", Augsburg, on February 5th, 1951, quoted this plan as follows:

"1. Battles to exhaust the invader between the Elbe and the Rhine.

2. If this zone should be conquered by the Russians a continuation of the wearing-down tactics on French soil where the non-French Atlantic powers should defend themselves in the so-called 'Belgian square'.

3. If this resistance should not last, the two southern peninsulas of Italy and Spain should be defended at all costs. The defensive line would run along the Alps and Pyrenees to give sufficient coastal points for landing operations.

4. Italy, Switzerland and Western Austria would be included inside this line."

General Omar Bradley, US Army Chief of General Staff, developed some of the basic ideas of his strategic plan for the American war in Europe to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington in August 1949. According to the report in the American magazine "Life", on August 29th, 1949. Bradley stated that:

"In view of the generally accepted fact that 175 active Russian divisions could push forward to the Atlantic coast without being stopped, a West European defence programme would be necessary in which the allied fleets would hold open the seas for bringing up reinforcements. The military thinking was based on the assumption that the west bank of the Rhine could be held by 25 to 30 divisions of rearmed and freshened European soldiers. In order to force a crossing Russia would have to concentrate her armies, thus providing worth-while targets for tactical air attack along lines of communication 1000 miles long while the men and material concentrated on the Rhine could be destroyed by US atomic bombs."

"Life" published a map making Bradley's strategie conception clear. Does General Bradley really believe that he can make the German people accept his strategic plan more easily if he lyingly alleges that the Soviet Union will be the attacker? Does he really believe that the bombs he plans to drop along the right bank of the Rhine will spare German lives and German cities?

One needs no special knowledge of military affairs—and many Germans have such special knowledge—to understand that if the Western powers should start a war, Germany would be the main theatre of that war. The consequences

such a criminal war would have particularly for our German homeland are easy to imagine, if we remember the devastation caused in the Second World War and add to it the damage which would be caused by atomic bombs and other "superweapons". One only has to imagine several dozen Hiroshimas. Anyone who thinks this phantastic, should note what is said by the highest military authorities of the United States and what is already happening in West Germany: the preparations being made by the Atlantic war bloc strategists to use scorched earth methods.

Plans to turn Upper Rhine Valley into a swamp

The American war leadership has made large scale plans to use the strategy of scorched earth at the cost of her West European allies. The practical preparations already made and being made in the area of the West German separatist state exceed those anywhere else however. The ghastliest project which has so far become known is the plan of the US aggressors to turn the Rhine-Main triangle into a watery waste. On June 18th, 1950, the Berlin newspaper "Neues Deutschland" published startling disclosures about the preparations made on American orders for the demolition of the Loreley crag and about the consequences which such demolition would entail for the Upper Rhine Valley.

This disclosure was promptly followed by denials issued by McCloy and his hacks. The facts can, however, not be concealed by dementis. Three months after these disclosures they were confirmed once again by a long article in the "Süddeutsche Zeitung" of Munich. The satanic plan of the American war leaders must not be allowed to be forgotten. Here is the full text of the report published by the "Süddeutsche Zeitung" on September 26th, 1950:

> "Vintage time is near. The high point of the year for the Rhine and the Moselle. Long banners hang across all roads with friendly invitation to the Wine Festivals.
>
> Practically none of the happy visitors will notice the heavy manhole covers on the roads of the area on the right bank of the Rhine. Underneath these covers demolition chambers, properly concreted, bore 14 ft deep into the rock. They are the same manhole covers which two months ago at the Loreley caused a heated public debate. In the meantime the waves of excitement have died down, new events took their place in the public eye and diverted attention from the fact that new demolition chambers were being constructed, quietly but at high speed, not only on the romantic Loreley but also in the valleys of the right bank of the Rhine. There for instance lies sleepy Altwied, crowned with the ruins of a medieval castle and buried deep in the heavily wooded valley of the river of the same name. With great difficulties the villagers, little over 500 in number, have rebuilt their bridge, which was blown up in the last days of the war. The recontruction cost 22,000 marks which included—the cost of demolition chambers! Next to the village the river is dammed to form a considerable lake. In the road alongside this lake are seven further demolition chambers only a few metres apart. The population are afraid that an explosion here would not only destroy the road but at the same time smash the pipes bringing water to the turbines, which run below the surface of the road alongside the cemetery, and thus cripple the power station.

About three miles above the village the Friedrichstal bridge arches high above the river Wied. The fresh concrete of the closed demolition chambers stands out clearly against the darker masonry. The mayor shrugs his shoulders with a gesture of resignation: 'We can't do anything about it, officially it's all part of the drainage system.' But the entire population down to the smallest child knows what is really going on.

The journey continues up the next valley. The mountains push together and the river Sayn gurgles beside the road. A little over a mile from Isenburg a bridge crosses the river. On both sides four further demolition chambers may be seen. Although this bridge has stood up to the storms of five centuries its massive rocky foundation must have given the engineer responsible for the demolition preparation a severe headache. In order to make quite sure he has had borings fifteen feet deep made into the foundations on both sides. On seeing a camera the foreman responsible forbids in a shocked voice any photographs being taken. 'This is a military zone. You can't do that here', he says, followed by a long explanation. Another boring will be made in the foundations parallel to the river banks from these 15 ft deep borings and then three further demolition chambers will be broken out on each side pointing to the apex of the bridge. That means that altogether fourteen demolition chambers are being prepared, probably enough to deal with this 500 year old bridge.

About a hundred feet away four families totalling 22 persons live on a farm called rather significantly 'Lachnit' (Laugh not) mill. These people, some of whom were bombed out during the war, really do not feel like laughing since the 14 demolition chambers, if they go off, would be sufficient to blow them and their rather rickety house to atoms.

The car climbs on through the mountains, up the steep path leading from the little town of Sayn to Stromberg. Round the corner are seven more demolition chambers which according to local inhabitants are 24 ft deep. A quick look round—the road is empty—and with a crowbar the heavy manhole cover is lifted. The hole goes straight down many feet into the rock. There is water 14 ft down and at 15 ft we run out of string. The Communists, the night before, had decorated the road and the cliffs with inscriptions yards high 'American soldiers homeward bound—the Loreley still stands its ground' and 'Away with the demolition chambers, fight for our united homeland'."

Preparations to blow up bridges and tunnels

On the entire territory of the West German separatist state preparations are being made to blow up bridges and railway tunnels, since the American headquarter in Heidelberg have supreme military command of the whole area. A large number of reports on these preparations have been made in the West German press. Here is a selection of them:

The "Schwäbische Landeszeitung", Augsburg, reported on February 16th 1951:

> "Several bridges across the Main have been fitted out with demolition chambers on the orders of the American army. According to information received by us it was originally intended to prepare demolition chambers in only five of the Main bridges. Since then, however, the preparations

have been extended to 40 more Bavarian bridges. The bridges in questions are among others those across the Danube, the Main, the Regen and bridges in the Bavarian forest and the Fichtel mountains. The (German, ed.) chief construction authority has refused to allow the road and river construction departments to assist in the action planned. For this reason the Post Engineers, this being the name of an American pioneer unit, had to take the preparations of the demolition chambers into their own hands. Three Bavarian firms were given contracts and were bound to strictest secrecy ... The chief construction authorities are particularily worried by the fact that the demolition chambers have to be built into the central piers of the bridges ... the Federal Ministry of Transport has taken a hand and ordered the provincial governments to hand over the bridge plans to the United States Army ..."

The newspaper "Unser Tag", Mannheim, dated March 20th 1951, reported:

"Following the courageous action of the town councils of Bamberg, Fürth and many other South German towns, all fractions of the town council of Miltenberg have agreed unanimously to oppose American demolition preparation on the town's bridges by all means. The town council had received a report that American pioneers had entered the chambers of the bridge armed with plans. After receiving this report the council ordered the district surveyor to fit special locks on the chambers of the bridge which was only restored last year after very difficult work."

The "Fuldaer Volkszeitung", dated March 21st 1951, stated:

"A demolition chamber was built into the new bridge over the Fulda at Bad Hersfeld. American circles stressed that this was only 'to a certain extent' a military measure. Demolition chambers were built into almost all bridges 'because they sometimes have to be blown up because of drift ice and things like that.'"

The "Mainpost", of Würzburg reported on March 22nd 1951, that the Würzburg town council had unanimously protested against the intention of the American occupation authorities to construct demolition chambers in the bridges of Würzburg:

"The Lord Mayor has already emphasised to General Futch and the Resident Officer Mr. Sega that for the people of Würzburg it is unthinkable that the bridges which had been rebuilt at such sacrifice should be endangered once again ... The spokesmen of all fractions rejected the suggestion that they should help to prepare the destruction of the bridges once again and commissioned the Lord Mayor to inform the occupation authorities to this effect."

The "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" of March 29th 1951, reported:

"Plans have already been prepared for the installation of demolition chambers in bridges and tunnels in various parts of Hessen. The 'demolition programme' for Upper Hessen is particularily extensive. Protests are continuously being received from this area by the government. The Alsfeld district has protested against the plan to instal demolition chambers in the big railway bridge between Alsfeld and Eifa."

In May 1951 American Headquarters in Heidelberg ordered that preparations for demolition be made in all bridges and tunnels on the railway lines leading from Bavaria to the German Democratic Republic. The railway authorities in Fürth were ordered to prepare the 320 yd long mountain tunnel near Erlangen on the railway line Saalfeld—Bamberg—Nuremberg—Munich for demolition.

Reports like this could be quoted indefinitely. The population in all parts of West Germany where there are bridges and tunnels with any trace of military significance can confirm these demolition preparations made on American orders. Confirmation which cannot be questioned is given in a general order issued by Adenauer. On April 20th, 1951, the "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" reported from Bonn:

> "In reply to a parliamentary question about preparations being made by the American occupation authorities for the demolition of bridges the Federal Chancellor replied that the Federal government was aware of such preparatory measures for bridge demolition. He added that the High Commissioners had declared that they were unable to dispense with the preparation of demolition chambers for military reasons. The Ministry of Transport had ordered that bridge plans be handed over to the American army."

The Elbe tunnel in Hamburg and the mines of the Ruhr are also included in the American "demolition programme".

The zone of death between Rhine and Elbe

Apart from the big preparations for the demolition of communications and industrial installations other military measures show that the American war leadership considers the area between the Rhine and Elbe as a zone of death in the war which they are preparing. Professor Kurt Hesse, military economy expert of the former nazi Wehrmacht, has drawn up a confidential memorandum on "German economic policy 1950/51 and the defence of Europe". Point 5r of this memorandum is particularily important in this connection because of the indication which it gives of a planned removal of the arms industry. Hesse states:

> "(r) introduction of a campaign to convince the workers of the necessity for the arms drive.
>
> There are serious objections, (in view of the known strategic considerations of the Atlantic pact leadership on the role of the area right of the Rhine) against using the Rhine-Westphalian industrial potential in too high a degree for armament purposes...
>
> It is, therefore, recommended to rebuild only an armaments industry of limited scope here, and to transfer other installations to the area left of the Rhine and into the vicinity of the Belgian-Dutch frontier. In addition the construction of arms industries in West Europe and North Africa with the aid of German capital, German specialists and German material could be considered..."

This proposal of Hesse's to move the armament industry is a proof that the area right of the Rhine is regarded as part of the zone of death of the American war.

(In addition, and this is not unimportant for the special plans of reviving German imperialism, Hesse's proposal if adopted would put the Belgian, Dutch, Luxembourg, and French partners of the Schuman plan into a position in which they could scarcely avoid being overshadowed by the German armaments industry.)

Number of airfields in West Germany increased

Another important military measure which indicates that the area to the right of the Rhine in the West German separatist state is regarded as a "wearing-down-area" is the establishment of new airbases left of the Rhine. In a secret discussion in Bad Homburg between Eisenhower and Adenauer it was agreed that 29 airbases on the left bank of the Rhine, including all those constructed by Hitler in 1940 should be extended.

The increase in the number of airfields in the area left of the Rhine got under way in autumn 1950. According to the "Deutsche Zeitung", Stuttgart, of November 22nd 1950, it was decided to make land available for airfields at a meeting held by the Prime Minister of North-Rhine Westphalia on October 10th 1950. At the end of October, in accordance with this decision, land in the area was Erkelenz was levelled without prior warning of the peasants to whom it belonged. About a thousand acres of fertile soil were removed from cultivation. "Die Welt", Hamburg, reported on November 24th 1950:

> "A new allied military airfield 1,700 acres in extent is to be constructed near Gillrath in the Geilenkirchen district. The installation has become necessary, General Bishop stated, because the old German Luftwaffe airfields no longer fulfilled the necessary ... conditions."

In May 1951 the French occupation troops requisitioned about 300 acres of agricultural land and forest near Zweibrücken on the frontier of the Saar territory to build a new airfield. All protests by the peasants remained unanswered, and a Frankfurt firm began to cut down the forest.

Naturally the looting of German peasant land for airfields, drill squares and manoeuvre areas is not confined to the area left of the Rhine. The many airfields of the Western powers in the areas right of the Rhine are being supplemented by new ones. At Oldenburg in June 1951 2,000 workers were engaged in enlarging the former Upjever fighter station into a large British military airfield. More than 1,200 acres of forest have been cleared to make room for low flying aircraft and other big clearings continue. The 180 families who lived in Upjever had to leave hearth and home and were provisionally accommodated in Heidemühlen. The houses of those turned out were pulled down. The cost of the airfield, modestly estimated at about 100 million marks, will be booked as occupation costs and paid by West German taxpayers.

> "A big military airfield is to be built at Petersberg near Bad Hersfeld. The cost of the construction and the purchase of the land used, which is mainly under crops, is estimated at several hundred thousand marks."
> (From "Kasseler Zeitung", Kassel, April 24th 1951.)

The "Hannoversche Presse" of March 9th 1951, reported that the Steinhuder lake, 12 square miles in extent, and neighbouring parts of the Neustädt heath were to be used as a rocket weapon testing range for the RAF. This decision

had been taken in the course of conversations held at the RAF airfield at Wunstorf. The district administration in Stadthagen and Neustadt had been informed of the intentions of the occupation power.

The Prime Minister of Rheinland-Pfalz told a CDU election meeting in Saarburg "The provincial government has been requested to provide territory in Rheinland-Pfalz for ten airfields." ("Die Rheinpfalz", Neustadt/W., April 24th 1951.)

Manoeuvre grounds and firing ranges in West Germany for American war

The proposal to make West Germany a manoeuvre ground for the troops of the Atlantic states, which according to the Paris edition of the "New York Herald Tribune" dated January 21st 1950, resulted from a conversation between McCloy and Averell Harriman, has since then largely materialised. The increase in the number of manoeuvre grounds and firing ranges for the troops of the Western powers in West Germany, and the extension of the manoeuvres beyond these grounds into land under crops, is a partial realisation of scorched earth strategy in the stage which precedes war. The "Stimme des Friedens", Frankfurt (Main), of February 1951 published the following review of the use of peasant land for manoeuvre grounds:

> "340,000 acres of land have so far been requisitioned for allied manoeuvre grounds in West Germany. This figure was named in a memorandum presented to the Federal Minister of Finance by a German liaison officer attached to the commandants of the allied manoeuvre grounds.
>
> 340,000 acres is more than half the entire area of Luxembourg. The individual manoeuvre grounds concerned are Bergen-Belsen of about 115 sq miles, Münster North of about 46 sq miles, Münster South of about 35 sq miles, Rheinsehlen of about 122 sq miles, Senne with about 77 sq miles, Grafenwöhr with about 77 sq miles and Heuberg with about 54 sq miles."

This review is certainly not complete, since it does not include for instance the island of Heligoland used as a bombing target by the British air force.

In addition the occupation powers in West Germany constantly demand new manoeuvre areas. According to a report by the United States District Commissioner and the German authorities, the French units stationed in Marburg have demanded that large manoeuvre areas be made available.

> "An area near to the Tannenberg group of barracks is to be requisitioned for tank exercises and an area of forest for infantry exercises. Near the former airfield of Butzweiler, near Cologne, the Belgian occupation authorities suddenly occupied about 18 acres of agricultural land. Some of the peasants were actually at work in their fields when the levelling commissions arrived." ("Wiesbadener Kurier", April 18th, 1951.)

In the Haardt district huge manoeuvre areas have been laid out in the North near Baumholder and a munition dump at Kirchheim-Bolanden. In the East near Eselsfurth and Speyer munition and tank depots have been established, a big depot has been built between Kaiserslautern and Pirmasens and in the South-east in the Landau area is a huge powder magazine, 1,000 yds long. Further North, on the other side of Hunsrück hills, V 2 launching ranges have been planned near Kochem.

According to the “Mainpost”, Würzburg, of June 1st 1951, 6,900 inhabitants of the villages in the Mainschleife area between Schweinfurth, Würzburg and Lohr are going to be forcibly evicted in order to make room for a tank training ground for the American troops of intervention, 12 miles long and 6 miles broad. The country districts of Bad Kissingen, Hammelburg, Gmünden, Karlstadt and Schweinfurth will be obliged to surrender very valuable agricultural areas, thereby completely wiping out 1800 farms which employ 15,000 people. In the area requisitioned by the US army 7 villages will have to be completely evacuated. 5,289 inhabitants of these villages will have to leave their home as well the 1,609 inmates of the resettlers’ camp at Hammelburg. The entire area to be evacuated amounts to about 10,000 acres.

> “British tanks in the district of Harburg and Lüneburg have caused severe damage to crops. One British tank unit operating at the edge of the Lüneburger heath ploughed up 100 acres of agricultural land in an hour and destroyed 50,000 lbs of growing corn. 14 villages have been affected by the damage.” (“Heilbronner Stimme”, Heilbronn, March 24th 1951.)

More than 150 acres of agricultural land had been destroyed by British tanks on manoeuvres in Lower Saxony, particularily on the Lüneburger heath, according to British officers who made a secret trip through the manoeuvre area. In the fields of the village of Wetzen near Harburg alone the armoured tracks of British tanks ploughed up 80 acres of land under crops.

> “The head of the German administration of the Lüneburg district, Dr. Koch, has requested speedy derequisitioning of the entire manoeuvre area near Lüneburg and in the Harburg district. British occupation authorities had announced that extended tank manoeuvres would take place after July 15th in the areas of Lüneburg and Harburg. Since the middle of March more than 600,000 marks worth of damage has been done in this area by tanks. This damage is stated to be four times as much as that caused by tanks in the Soltau district during the whole of last year. The occupation authorities have ordered the road construction department to improve and strengthen the roads and provide tank turn-tables in the manoeuvre areas. This work will cost about a million marks.” (“Wesermünder Rundschau”, June 18th 1951.)

Social Democrat Schumacher adopts Goebbels’ suicidal strategy

Facts have been given about the extent to which preparations have been made for using scorched earth strategy on German soil; about the preparations to blow up communications and industrial facilities; about the preparations to flood entire tracts of land famed in German history; about the increase in the number of military airfields, manoeuvre grounds and large firing ranges; and about the destruction of agricultural land through tank exercises. All these facts are only a small extract from what is going on in West Germany. They give a slight foretaste of the fate which threatens the entire territory of the West German separatist state in the case of aggression by the war powers of the Atlantic pact bloc. Under the eyes of the Germans themselves preparations are being made

to destroy the land and the means of life of that part of the German nation which lives in the area of the West German separatist state, to end the existence of the Germans as a nation. All this is being done with the help of people of German origin.

The American war, and thereby the ruin of our homeland and nation, are being prepared in West Germany by the monopolists, junkers and old-guard militarists together with Adenauer who rules in their interests, and the obedient "opposition" provided by Schumacher, Ollenhauer and Co. Adenauer's government provides the American warmongers with everything that a puppet government can provide, including the plans of bridges and tunnels so that the enemy can prepare their demolition. The militarists of German origin work out plans for the Wall Street strategists by which war should be fought out on German soil. The orders to be given to a German army are:

> "Possible invader to be engaged for the decisive battle in the area between the Elbe and the Rhine. Mobile defence over large areas. No defence of 'lines'. Prevention of Rhine crossing." ("Mittelbayerische Zeitung", Regensburg, August 14th 1950.)

Translated into normal German this means: After the "lightning war" against the East try to make sure that Germany remains the main theatre of war. In order to do this the Germans, by means of mobile defence, should flatten their own land and slaughter each other in a fratricidal war—Korea on a large scale.

The attempt to win the German people to such a madness is the attempt to make them a nation of suicides. It is a difficult task and at the same time criminal and treasonable in the highest degree. But Dr. Schumacher is ready to take the job on, to try once again Goebbels' strategy of suicide. Schumacher is using a recipe worked out in advance with Eisenhower and the gentlemen of Wall Street. He wants the same thing as his bosses—war against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, starting with civil war in Germany. But Schumacher stands in "opposition" to Adenauer who wants just the same thing. What is the sense of this "opposition"? Schumacher does not want to be outdone by any German faction in inviting as many American soldiers as possible to West Germany. On August 23rd, 1950, he stated in Bonn:

> "It is incomprehensible that the American divisions have their training in Texas and Arizona instead in Grafenwöhr or the Lüneburger heath." ("Nordbayerische Volkszeitung", Nuremberg, November 25th 1950.)

It has been shown already, and further proof will be given, that Eisenhower fully understands Schumacher's worry and is making sure that the American invasion forces and the forces of the other Atlantic pact countries in West Germany should be continually reinforced. Schumacher's second wish is for a German army as strong as possible, established in accordance with an army law proposed by him, which will make it possible to mobilise the entire reserve of manpower in West Germany for the new mass army. Eisenhower is in full agreement with this aim too.

The only question is what these aims have to do with opposition to Adenauer, since Adenauer wants just the same things. The explanation is that the American warmongers need a man with as broad an influence as possible particularily among the industrial workers, a man who will play at "opposition"

until his demands are fulfilled. That is, until the strongest possible American British force has been built up in West Germany so that the German people, dependent on these allies like a hanged man on the rope, may be more speedily won for remilitarisation and offensive war against the East. It is no coincidence that what Schumacher is aiming at is exactly what the American warmongers want.

The only thing that remains for him to do is to persuade the Germans that war would not be so bad for them since, from the second day on, it would be waged east of the Eastern frontier of Germany, thanks to the fact that a strong German army would be able to rely on strong fighting forces of the Atlantic pact states. Schumacher, Ollenhauer, Carlo Schmid and Reuter are attempting to win the support of part of the German people for the American war by using this fraudulent stupidity about "lightning war". Schumacher's demands to the US strategists that the war against the East must begin east of the Vistula is a criminal attempt to mislead the Germans. The idea is to lull the German people to sleep with the promise that Germany will not be the theatre of war, as if overrunning and occupying the territory of the German Democratic Republic and Poland were a harmless bankholiday outing, and as if Germany would remain untouched by war as "rear" of the American anti-Soviet military campaign. With his criminal lie Schumacher also wants to get the German people used to the idea that war against the Soviet Union is the most natural thing in the world for Germans. It should be noted that Schumacher and his accomplices make the least attempt of all members of the American war party to describe the war against the Soviet Union as a "defence war".

> "*At the annual meeting of the 'Americans for democratic action' association Ernst Reuter, Mayor of Berlin, stated that it was high time to stop thinking only in terms of defence. He requested increased American help for Berlin.*" ("Die Welt", Hamburg, February 28th 1951.)

According to the "Nürnberger Nachrichten", of October 25th 1950, Dr. Schumacher had been demanding for months "the stationing of numerous allied divisions in Germany in order to fight the first battle on the Elbe and the second on the Vistula in case of war; the reinforcements announced were not sufficient and would not guarantee security."

The "Hamburger Echo" of February 26th 1951, reported:

> "The Deputy-Chairman of the Social Democratic Party, Erich Ollenhauer, reported in Bonn after an information trip through the United States lasting nearly three weeks that the Americans were 'completely determined to undertake enormous efforts in the interests of rearmament. It is essential that the German people should be convinced by the sum total of American actions that in an emergency the Americans wanted to defend Europe as far east as possible.'"

> "Speaking at a public meeting in Munich Carlo Schmid, Social Democratic Deputy-Chairman of Parliament, emphasised that the Social Democrats would only support German cooperation in the defence of Europe if they could be certain that in case of war the second battle would already be fought out east of the Vistula in Poland. He expressed the opinion that it

was better to be bolshevised in an undamaged house than to be bolshevised when one was a cripple living in a hole in the earth." (Quarterly report of the American High Commissioner for Germany, October 1st to December 31st 1950.)

3. German mercenaries as "suicide squads" for the American war

A glance at history

Remilitarisation in West Germany recalls the reinforcement of German militarism after the First World War. Although historical processes never repeat themselves in exactly the same way there are a number of parallels in this case. First, however, the differences should be examined.

The defeat of German imperialism in 1945 was more total and all inclusive than in 1918. The use of the term "total defeat" is justified in so far as the nazi state and army were destroyed and the Potsdam Agreement laid the foundations for preventing the revival of German imperialism and militarism for all time. The victory over the fascist aggressors had changed the whole basis of international relationships. The young Socialist state was fighting hard for its existence in 1918, but by 1945 it had become the strongest state in the world, and after the victory over the fascist aggressors it became the stable main bastion of the world peace camp which is today undefeatable. The part of the world controlled by the imperialists has shrunk considerably and the general crisis of capitalism has sharpened. The imperialists are trying to revise the world situation in their favour and as the means thereto they see war against the main bastion of the world peace camp, against the Soviet Union. American monopoly capital, American imperialism, is the dominant force in the camp of war. American imperialism wants to form from the armies of other states storm troops against the Soviet Union and against the People's Democracies. That is why German imperialism and militarism have been revived after their total defeat in 1945. That is why there is a considerable difference with regard to remilitarisation between the situation today and the situation in 1918. It is, of course, true that at that time the victorious powers met the requests of the German imperialists and militarists to a limited extent in regard to certain concessions in the speed and scale of disarmament, concessions which appeared useful to the victors for combatting Soviet Russia and the German revolution. For the same reason, in order to preserve Germany as a "wall against Bolshevism", they permitted and encouraged, "behind the scenes", the regrowth of German militarism. But they did at least do it "behind the scenes". It would have been unthinkable, for instance, for the representatives of French imperialism to have appeared as sponsors of a revival of German militarism as they are doing today on orders from Wall Street. An important difference between 1918 and today is that after 1918 German militarism reestablished itself against the desire of the Western powers, particularily French imperialism, and against the desire of a great part of the German people and that today it is being put on its feet again at express speed on the orders of the imperialist victors, particularily the imperialist United States. German militarism is being revived despite the resistance of the overwhelming majority of the German people and despite the threat which

it represents to the security of the other Atlantic pact states. The motive for reestablishing German imperialism and militarism is the same as it was in 1918 and sails under the same colours. It is simply the reconstruction of the old position of power under a slogan which the Western powers like: the fight against Bolshevism. Then as now this was the slogan which gave German imperialism a new lease of life.

The same social forces are at work now as then: German monopolists, junkers, militarists and Social Democratic leaders. Even some of the people and some of the families are the same.

Some of the representatives of German imperialism and militarism are seriously counting on reestablishing the hegemony of German imperialism, at least in Europe. They are like the ambitious junior partner of a firm who was boss himself once and after two bankruptcies is trying to climb back into power again.

American imperialism nourishes this ambition since the more determinedly the German junior partner cries for the moon the more ruthlessly will it fight the Socialist Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. American imperialism wants to make German imperialism so strong that it will lead the wolf pack of the Atlantic pact states. This is how American imperialism wants to use the West German reservoir of manpower for the American war. It sticks closely to Truman's slogan: let other peoples slaughter each other for the benefit of American monopolists.

Not our boys

The Anglo-American warmongers are particularily interested in German soldiers. The Democratic Senator Elmer Thomas from Oklahoma was quoted by the "New York Times" on November 27th 1949 as saying:

> "Germany used to be a great military power. The Germans are great fighters. If the United States gets into a war again we shall need fighters. In this war we want to have Germany on our side."

On November 4th 1949 Robert Poage from Texas, Democratic Member of the House of Representatives, proposed the raising of a West German army of mercenaries 25 divisions strong. (Congressional Record November 4th 1949.) General Collins was speaking in the same spirit when he stated in May 1950: "It should be enough if we send arms. Our sons must not shed their blood in Europe. *There are enough Germans who can die for US interests.*"

Lord Trenchard, former Commander-in-Chief of the Royal Airforce, writing in the "Observer" on Churchill's demand for a West European army stated: "*We must demand from West Germany that it provides the majority of the West European ground forces.*" The West European states would have to provide ground forces and Great Britain's main task would be to reenforce its airforce. (DPA, August 21st 1950.)

In October 1950 the "New York Times" expressed the complete cynicism of the American slavedealers:

"It will be particularily important to find new sources for manpower reserves which can only come from Germany. America has the right to demand a dollar's worth of fight for every dollar which it spends."

On May 15th 1951 the same paper stated: "Germany and German manpower potential are indispensable components of strategic planning." Senator Taft, who has already been quoted, stated:

"It is cheaper to wage war with soldiers of foreign nations, even if we have to arm them, than with American boys and above all we save American lives." ("New York Times", May 20th 1951.)

Eisenhower does not want Hessian mercenaries

In the last two years imperialist propaganda calls for German cannon fodder for American war have taken on the definite form of a demand for the establishment of West German military units. Bargaining has gone on in the Parliaments of the Western powers and at their diplomatic conferences about the extent, the armament and the command of the German forces and direct negotiations have been opened on remilitarisation with representatives of German militarism, with the Bonn government, and with Social Democratic leaders.

These slave dealers are greatly worried about the attitude adopted by the German people. Their lives and existence are at stake but despite this their opinion is not only not asked but they are banned from proffering it. The "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung" stated on December 23rd 1950:

"The simple truth, which seems to be as unpopular as ever, is that the question of German rearmament does not just consist in giving 100,000 people uniforms but in winning over an entire nation."

This comment did not arise from opposition to remilitarsation but from the attempt to bargain for the highest possible price, in the form of political concessions. However, the "unknown quantity" in the calculations of the warmongers is shown, that "unknown quantity" which very justifiably troubles the Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic Pact forces. Eisenhower, reporting on his impressions of France, Belgium and Italy to the Senate and House of Representatives in Washington on February 1st 1951, stated:

"I had special reasons for not yet mentioning my various talks in Germany. I personally believe that in this question we shall have to find a political platform, an agreement aiming at eventual and deserved equality for this nation before we talk about incorporating German units in any sort of army. Certainly I as commander want no reluctant contingents in an army under my command. I want no soldiers who fight like the Hessians fought in our war of independence. That would only be a source of weakness. That is why it is not good for the soldiers to go too deeply into

> the question until the political leaders, the diplomats and statesmen have produced an acceptable answer to the question." ("New York Times", February 2nd 1951.)

Although in these remarks Eisenhower talks diplomatically around the stage reached by remilitarisation in West Germany which he knows only too well, he puts his finger on the decisive point: *the lack of readiness of the working people of West Germany to allow themselves to be driven into war again.* That is why he demands that the politicans, diplomats and statesmen should agree on the concessions to be offered to the representatives of German imperialism and militarism.

Diplomatic fencing on remilitarisation

The agreement by politicians, diplomats and statesmen demanded by Eisenhower early in 1951 has developed further in the meantime, mainly on the basis of American wishes. The warmongers in the United States are in a great hurry and press for quick and extensive remilitarisation of West Germany. While negotiations between the United States and the European Atlantic pact powers on remilitarisation are still in progress remilitarisation itself has been planned in all details and put into effect by the American and German militarists, with considerable regard for proposals made by the German militarists. A surprise coup patterned on Hitler's coup in 1935, by which conscription would be reintroduced in West Germany, can be expected at any time.

The diplomatic fencing which hides the preparation for remilitarisation is a primitive attempt at camouflage on the part of the American warmakers. The speeches and acts of American politicians, diplomats, military men and statesmen prove clearly that they want a war against the Soviet Union. They also prove that they want such a war quickly and that the war preparations are, for them, a race against time, that is to say a race against the growing resistance to war shown by the peoples. Their speeches and deeds prove also beyond a doubt that West Germany's war potential, particularily her manpower potential, is the most essential and therefore the most desired force for the American war in Europe.

American imperialism claims for itself the role of remaining in the rear and holding its own forces as "strategic reserves" in the Third World War which it desires and is preparing. That is why it wishes to make the war in Europe appear to be the business of the West European states, and to describe active American intervention only as a supporting move based on the "historic mission" of the United States as "saviour of civilisation".

That is why American intervention is represented as the "desire" of the West European states, as the answer to their requests for help. France, as the European power which fears German imperialism and militarism most, and which has the strongest prejudices against them, is forced to appear as initiator of the West European "defence pact" which gives German imperialism and militarism new life and a new position of power. The catch phrase of West Germany's integration in the European "defence system" is designed to remove the objections of the West European states to the strengthening of German

imperialism and militarism and at the same time to provide this imperialism and militarism with the position which the United States want to see them occupy. That is the reason for the Schuman plan and the Pleven plan. It is made to appear as if consideration was given to the wish of French imperialism to appear as the first class European Continental power. This does not mean, of course, that all differences between the Western powers on the type and scope of West German remilitarisation have been removed, but the decision has been taken on the principle. That is the pattern of the diplomatic fencing which surrounded the question of West Germany's remilitarisation, in the course of which the Western powers were supposed to have requested the United States to include West Germany in the European defence system.

The definite form of West German remilitarisation is in the main being negotiated between the representatives of United States imperialism and its main European ally, German imperialism. In this connection too, as in others, the main consideration is: the "civilisation saving mission" of the United States "demands" that she should preserve her forces as "strategic reserves" and only offer her aid on the "urgent request" of the "particularily exposed" and therefore "particularly needy" German "vanguard of Western civilisation"—meaning the German monopolists, militarists and their Social Democratic thugs.

These representatives of German imperialism know well how valuable they are for the American war. That is why they are by no means modest in their military and political demands. This is shown by the quarterly report for January 1st to March 31st 1951 issued by American High Commissioner McCloy. He underlines with great emphasis the French initiative and leadership in establishing a European army as the indispensable basis for a United Europe. The Pleven plan, supplementing the Schuman plan, deals with the creation of a European army with the inclusion of German units. However, all states taking part with the exception of the Bonn separatist state will have the right to maintain a national army in addition to the units in the European army.

Dr. Schumacher and the German militarists particularly oppose this. Schumacher demands full equality with all states taking part and the German militarists protest against the fact that it is only proposed to give them small units and no independent power of command. "Wide circles of Germans distrust the military competence of the French and their strategic conception of the defence of Europe." (McCloy.)

The representatives of United States imperialism fully understand the "opposition" of the representatives of German imperialism and militarism and are glad to meet their demands in so far as this ensures the greatest possible exploitation of the "military strength of West Germany". Basically that is the main point for the United States imperialists.

The military and political concessions made by the Americans strengthen the position of German imperialism. They allow the bosses of the Bonn separatist state to mislead the population of West Germany with talk about "successes" with regard to reestablishing the "sovereignty" of the German state and its position as an "independent power", even though these "concessions" only damage German unity. The American "concessions" are directed exactly at

deepening the split through Germany and making it possible for the West German supporters of American imperialism to break the resistance to remilitarisation of the overwhelming majority of the population.

American invasion to support remilitarisation

On August 29th 1950 Adenauer submitted a secret memorandum to the Chairman of the "Allied High Commission", Mr. McCloy which stated in part:

> "*The Federal Chancellor has repeatedly requested the reinforcement of the occupation troops and renews this request herewith in the most urgent form.* The reinforcement of the Allied occupation troops is also necessary because the measures of defence now beginning in West Europe can only be carried out without being disturbed behind the protection of a sufficient number of well trained Allied divisions. The Federal Chancellor has further often repeated his readiness to make a contribution, in the form of a German contingent, if an international West European army is established." ("Die Neue Zeitung", Munich, November 27th 1950.)
>
> "On August 24th responsible politicians from the government and the opposition issued press statements which helped ... to clarify the situation. Federal Chancellor Adenauer ... supported the formation of a Federal police to combat seditious elements inside the country but referred external security to the realm of responsibility of the occupation powers. *He demanded the strengthening of the Allied forces in Germany and declared...* Germany would be ready to join a mutual security system on acceptable conditions ...
>
> Dr. Kurt Schumacher, opposition leader, ... adopted the point of view *that the only real guarantee for the preservation of peace was the concentration of considerably reinforced Allied troops in West Germany.*" (Quarterly report of the American High Commissioner for Germany. Official German version. Period of report: October 1st to December 31st, 1950.)

The appeal of the Bonn politicians which had been agreed with Washington's emmissaries was readily fulfilled by the Western occupation powers. For months the reinforcements have been arriving in a quantity and at a speed that make it possible to speak of an invasion. The "Münchener Allgemeine", Munich, described the "invasion" in the following words:

> "While the United States Senate ... after a long debate, agreed to Truman's plan to send 4 further American divisions to Western Europe, the long planned reinforcement of the Allied troops in Germany has already begun ... According to information from European Headquarters in Heidelberg the monthly arrivals amount to between 4,000 and 5,000 men."

With the arrival of the 82nd Parachute Division there would be three American divisions up to war strength on German soil, the paper reported. They would be armed with weapons which had shown their value in Korea. The British had brought their 2nd Infantry Division and 7th Tank Division up to full war

strength during the winter months. Up to April they had been supplemented by the 11th British Tank Division and a further infantry division was expected. France already had three divisions in Germany and wanted to bring the figure up to five divisions ready for action in the course of the year.

> "In addition to the eight strong divisions immediately available there is one Belgian, one Danish and one Norwegian brigade ... Atlantic Commander-in-Chief Eisenhower will presumably control a force 15 or 16 divisions strong by autumn."

The facts given by the "Münchener Allgemeine" agree with the figures which had been announced about the reinforcement of the Western powers in West Germany. It must be assumed that the reinforcements are more numerous than has been stated in official reports. Up to the end of 1951 the Americans want to have three times as many intervention troops in West Germany as they had at the end of 1950. In addition to the Western powers' reinforcements it should be noted that a new arrangement has been arrived at by which the troops of all occupation powers can be moved freely between the three zones, thus making their most effective use possible.

Strong air force contingents must be added to the Western powers' forces already mentioned. According to the "Nürnberger Nachrichten" of June 6th, 1951, the American Secretary of State for Air, Finletter, stated:

> "The West must try to establish clear air supremacy in Europe and for this reason the United States Airforce planned to put the majority of its tactical formations at the disposal of the Atlantic defence force ..."

High Commissioner McCloy gave a very frivolous "excuse" for the speeded-up invasion of the Atlantic Pact forces in his quarterly report for January 1st to March 31st 1951. He stated that the United States, Great Britain and France had begun "to reinforce their troops stationed in Germany. The Germans had shown great dissatisfaction at the rise in occupation costs which thus became necessary. On the other hand the reinforcement of the Allied forces in Europe; the activation of Eisenhower's headquarters in Europe; the increase in the activity of the North Atlantic Pact organisation, together with the unheard of economic and military mobilisation in the United States and the improved situation in Korea helped to remove the great anxiety which the Germans in West Germany had shown at the turn of the year." According to the same report "Communist aggression" consisted of Communist propaganda "which can be compared in a high degree to military aggression". It is a really frivolous reversal of facts fraudulently to describe as "military aggression" the peace propaganda of the Communists and above all of the Soviet Union, in order to justify the feverish speed of Western rearmament.

The American invasion of West Germany showed up the serious sharpening of the general danger of aggression. It is also a move in support of the remilitarisation of West Germany since according to Schumacher the objections of Social Democracy to rearmament disappear in ratio to the speed with which Atlantic Pact troops flood into West Germany.

In contrast to this treasonable attitude taken up by the Schumacher clique, Otto Grotewohl, Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic, exposed the true character of the Western occupation troops in an important speech in Berlin on July 21st 1950. He stated:

"The Western occupation troops are no longer in Germany to carry out the tasks laid down for them by the Potsdam Declaration, namely the democratisation of Germany and the prevention of a new aggression. On the contrary they serve an aim alien to this international agreement by carrying out their cold war. The Western occupation troops have therewith completely lost the character of occupation troops and have become an army of undisguised intervention, aiming at national suppression and the creation of a military strategic base in West Germany to unleash a new war against the Soviet Union, against democratic Germany and the countries of the People's Democracies. The masses of the population of the West zones of Germany, the workers and the peasants, the intellectuals and the middle class now have a double yoke to bear. Their national liberation will be a preliminary condition for the social liberation of the exploited working people of Germany."

4. Creating the "psychological conditions"

Eisenhower rehabilitates German "soldierly honour"

In order to speed up the remilitarisation of West Germany the Americans took steps in January 1951 to win the support of German militarists, generals and officers of the former nazi Wehrmacht, and big shot war criminals for the American war. One step was the rehabilitation of German "soldierly honour" by General Eisenhower, and the other was the large scale amnesty for nazi war criminals proclaimed by McCloy and General Thomas T. Handy. The American journalist Drew Middleton, writing in the "New York Times" on January 24th 1951, reported:

"Progress with regard to the rearmament of West Germany which was laid down as 'an urgent measure' at the Brussels Conference of Foreign Ministers in December 1950 had been neglected although officials in the office of the American High Commissioner and General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the most famous supporter of strength through unity, have done their best to push the Germans into acting.

The Commander-in-Chief, before leaving for Paris, issued a statement which aimed at convincing the Germans, particularly the soldiers, that the West was ready to recognise them as honourable comrades-in-arms in the task of rebuilding European military might. General Eisenhower declared: 'I told the Chancellor and the other German gentlemen with whom I spoke last night that I had come to the conclusion that there really was a difference between the regular German soldiers and officers on the one hand and Hitler and his criminal group on the other. I do not believe that the German soldier has lost his honour.'

This statement had obviously been inspired by United States officials who have to deal with German complaints that the honour of the German army and its officers had been violated by the Allies since the war."

This report can be supplemented by a leading article in the "Rhein-Neckar Zeitung" quoted by the Berlin newspaper "Der Morgen" on January 30th 1951:

"In order to wage war one naturally needs soldiers. What could be more natural than to rehabilitate the ordinary German soldier in his offended honour so that he picks up his rifle again? If German soldiers were not urgently needed then General Eisenhower would certainly not have made this statement, which he has had a chance of making for the past five years."

Eisenhower's statement is also significant in that at the time when American troops entered Germany he had declared that he made no distinction between nazis and other Germans.

To show up General Eisenhower's action quite clearly one must recall what he wrote in the first number of the "Neue Zeitung", Munich, the organ of the American Military Government on October 18th 1945:

"The purge of nazidom will be carried out with all means at our disposal. It will not only affect party members but all those who profited from National Socialism in one way or another. There are no 'indispensable' National Socialists . . .

In addition to National Socialism militarism must also be destroyed. The outer demilitarisation of Germany is being successfully carried out, but this alone provides no guarantee that Germany will not force the world into a new war in the future. Militarism must be extirpated from German thought. For all civilised peoples of the world war is something immoral. The Germans must, however, be educated into this obvious truth. Here too the German people must blot out the dangerous roots of their philosophy."

Eisenhower's declaration in January 1951 is also dishonest. He isolates himself in words from Hitler and his group and almost at the same time, with his knowledge and approval, war criminals who belonged to the Hitler clique are amnestied by the American High Commissioner and the Commander-in-Chief of the American forces in Europe. In order to rearm Germany and wage war against the Soviet Union Eisenhower allies himself with the nazi war criminals whom he knows and values as the most brutal enemies of peace and the Soviet Union. Those who put themselves on an equal footing with people whom they had formerly justly condemned as criminals against humanity thereby condemn themselves.

Today the former nazi officers are indispensable for Eisenhower for the American war which he wants to force upon the Germans. He is reawakening German militarism in order to make it serve this immoral war.

Amnesty for nazi war criminals — preparation for American war

In December 1949 60 war criminals who had been sentenced by the Allied Military Court at Nuremberg and who had not by a long stretch served their sentences, were released from Landsberg prison as the result of a partial amnesty by the American occupation authorities. This first big scale "act of mercy" followed closely on the debate in the American House of Representatives and the subsequent decision of the United States government to carry out the greatest economic and military mobilisation in the history of the country.

The second broad mercy and amnesty action for nazi war criminals by General Thomas T. Handy, Commander-in-Chief of the American forces in Europe, and Mr. McCloy, American High Commissioner in Germany, followed on January 31st 1951. A total of ten from fifteen death sentences which had not yet been carried out were commuted to prison sentences. The sentences of 36 convicted war criminals were considerably reduced and 32 war criminals were immediately released without finishing their sentences. Cannon king Alfried Krupp, who had been given fifteen years for using war prisoners and forced foreign labourers as slaves and for illtreating them, had his sentence quashed and his entire fortune, which had been confiscated, returned to him.

This provocative American amnesty coincided with Eisenhower's inspection visit, his negotiation with the Bonn government, with German generals, and with the Social Democrat Ollenhauer representing Dr. Schumacher, and with Eisenhower's attempt, as reported by the American journalist Drew Middleton, to speed up German action in regard to rearmament.

> "Among those whose death sentence was reduced by the amnesty to life imprisonment was Lieutenant-Colonel Joachim Peiper, commander of a unit which massacred 142 unarmed American soldiers who had surrendered during the battle near Malmedy in Belgium.
>
> Among the decisions taken by McCloy special interest attaches to the fact that the prison sentence of 20 years passed on the former Major-General Wilhelm Speidel was regarded as served by his imprisonment up to date. He took part in the shooting of hostages in the Soviet Union. General Speidel is a brother of the former Lieutenant-General Hans Speidel, a member of the West German Committee which negotiates with the Allies on the possible remilitarisation of West Germany.
>
> Despite heavy pressure on the part of the Germans Mr. McCloy has not changed the life imprisonment sentences passed on the former generals Wilhelm List and Walter Kuntze... Mr. McCloy will, however, look into the possibility, on the recommendation of the amnesty committee, of making releases on medical grounds as is often done in similar cases in the United States." ("New York Times", February 1st 1951.)

Professor Carlo Schmid, a Social Democratic leader, commenting on this amnesty, remarked that it was a pity that General Handy had not gone further in revising the sentences in the Malmedy case.

Apparently McCloy, whose own compatriots were concerned in the Malmedy case, and the Social Democratic leader Carlo Schmid see nothing to condemn in the shooting of defenceless war prisoners. By their attitude they show their solidarity with the nazi war criminals and the latter will know how to show their gratitude. In this attitude Schmid is in agreement with his British party colleague Reginald Paget, Labour Member of Parliament and Counsel for the Defence in the trial of the former Field Marshall von Manstein. According to a report in the "Wiesbadener Kurier", of November 2nd, 1950, Paget had demanded a rehabilitation of the former German Wehrmacht in the House of Commons. German soldiers who had been sentenced because of war crimes should be released so that "the right Germans join the Western defence forces", he said. In July 1950 Lord Hankey, who during the war had been a member of

the British war cabinet, called for an immediate amnesty for German and Japanese war criminals. He said: "If we want to defeat the present danger of Communism we must bury all our differences and strive for friendship with our former enemies." (Bornemann-Dienst, Dusseldorf, July 1950.) The British High Commisioner for Germany, Kirkpatrik, stated in January 1951 in an interview in Berlin: "If I could do what I wanted I believe it would be right to revise the sentences on the Spandau war criminals Hess, Raeder, Dönitz and Co. But that is not so easy. I regard it as my duty to examine the cases of all German war criminals but this case lies in the hands of all four occupation powers and I scarcely believe that the Soviet Union has changed her point of view." ("Nacht-Express", Berlin, January 17th 1951.)

At the beginning of February the following leading German war criminals were released by the Western powers:

Former generals:

Hollidt, Otto Woehler, Wilhelm Speidel, Ernst von Leyser.

Former state and party officials:

Josef Altstetter, former Secretary of State in the Ministry of Justice; Bohle, former head of the Foreign Organisation of the NSDAP and Gauleiter; von Weizsäcker, former Secretary of State in the Foreign Ministry; Steengracht von Moyland; Woermann, former nazi Ambassador; Otto Dietrich, former nazi press chief; Walter Darré, former nazi peasant leader; Franz Schlegelberger, former Deputy-Minister of Justice; Günter Joel, former public prosecutor in the "People's Court"; Ernst Lautz, former nazi jurist; Wilhelm von Ammon, former leading civil servant; Hans Kehrel, former head of the planning department; Wilhelm Keppler, former Secretary of State and Hitler's economic adviser; Graf Lutz von Schwerin-Krosigk, former Minister of Finance; Kurt Rothenberger, former nazi jurist.

Former SS staff responible for the crimes in the concentration camps:

Former SS officers Erwin Tschentscher; Hans Loerner; Hans Bayer; Hans Bobermin; Hermann Pock; Max Kiefer; Hans Hohberg. Helmut Poppendick who was responsible for the medical experiments carried out in the concentration camps.

Former officials of the "Central Racial Department"

Fritz Schwalm; Heinz Brückner; Herbert Hübner.

Industrialists:

Emil Puhl, former President of the Reichsbank; Georg von Schnitzler and Fritz ter Meer, directors of IG Farben; Friedrich Flick, big industrialist; Alfried Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach, arms king; Friedrich von Bülow, Erich Müller, Eduard Houdremont, Friedrich Janssen, Karl Eberhardt, Max Ihm, Heinrich Kerschen, Heinrich Lehmann, directors of Krupps; Karl Rasche, director of the Dresdner Bank.

Since this date more war criminals have been released by the British and French authorities. In his quarterly report for January 1st to March 31st 1951 McCloy hypocritically declared that the amnesty action had not been influenced in any way by political considerations, but it is clear that exactly the opposite

is true. This large scale amnesty of nazi war criminals by the American occupation powers is of great importance in view of the war being prepared by the United States. The amnesty campaign is founded on the conception that war is no longer, as Eisenhower rightly wrote in 1945, "something immoral". Those who start a new war would therefore not be called to personal account for their criminal acts, opposed to humanity and peace, as the allies did to the war criminals of the Second World War. By amnestying the criminals of the Second World War those who want to start a third world war intend to try to amnesty themselves in advance.

A vivid impression of the revival of German militarism, which Eisenhower wanted to extirpate in 1945, may be gained by reading a list of those amnestied and the German generals and officers who are helping to prepare the American war, the Third World War. After the First World War German militarism won a decisive victory on the psychological front by obtaining allied consent to drop the trial of war criminals and by obtaining the "recognition of German soldierly honour". The results of allowing German militarism to grow strong again are well known, as are its toughness and brutality. It is exactly this quality which the butchers of Korea seek to use for their war in Europe.

"Ending the state of war"—no peace treaty

On July 9th 1951 the three Western occupation powers staged a particularly big swindle as part of their "psychological war preparations".

> "On July 9th 1951 the three Western powers informed the Adenauer government through their High Commissioner on the Petersberg, that they regarded the state of war with Germany as ended. A number of other states took the same step.
>
> The real reason for this declaration is to remove the last formal obstacle, to include Germany at a speedier rate in the aggressive North Atlantic Pact system and to speed up its conversion to an arms base and military base for the planned war against the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic.
>
> Six years after the end of the Second World War the German people demand a real removal of the state of war by the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.
>
> The fraud committed by the governments of the USA, Great Britain and France on the German people was shown up by United States President Truman himself in his message to Congress. He wrote: 'Ending the state of war with Germany will not affect the status of occupation. The rights of the occupation powers arise from the conquest of Germany, and by ending the state of war we do not abandon these rights.'
> The declaration of the Western powers and this message of Truman's lead clearly to the following conclusions:
>
> (1) The Western powers refuse the German people, now as before, the peace treaty which is their due.

(2) The Western powers preserve their occupation regime unchanged and wish to make permanent the occupation of Germany. Article 3 of the Occupation Statute which expressly lays down the unlimited rights of the occupation powers remains in force.

(3) They intend to maintain the partitioning of Germany since the creation of a united independent democratic and peace-loving Germany would mean peace in Europe, which would run counter to their plans for preparing a new war.

(4) The Western powers ignore the Potsdam Agreement which pledged the occupation troops to extirpate the roots of fascism and militarism and to make possible the construction of a new democratic order in a united Germany. This contempt for the reasons for the occupation have converted the Western armies into intervention troops contrary to international law.

The government of the German Democratic Republic formally declares that the step of the Western states runs contrary to the vital interests of the entire German people, is a contradiction of the Potsdam Agreement and thus possesses no legal force and no international authority.

...The German people want peace. The plebiscite against the remilitarisation of Germany and for a peace treaty with Germany in 1951 proves clearly the desire for peace of the German people." (From the declaration made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to the Cabinet of the German Democratic Republic on July 17th 1951.)

5. The German General Staff at work

The general staff — the root and the driving force of revived German militarism

The root of German militarism and its driving force was always the strongly Prussian general staff. After defeat in 1945, despite its dissolution by the victorious powers, exactly as after defeat after 1918, the general staff continued to exist under many disguises. Although the Prussian-German general staff was officially dissolved on the orders of the Entente after 1918 it remained the political breeding ground of German imperialism. Central H. Q. under Hindenburg and Groener was the focal point of the German counter-revolution. The conter-revolutionary victory was the basis for the restrengthening of German imperialism. The representatives of German militarism dropped "their Kaiser" and kept their position thanks to their alliance with the leaders of German Social Democracy, the spiritual fathers of Schumacher, Ollenhauer, etc. This happened at a time when the later "Führer" was acting as an insignificant spy for the Reichswehr (army) in Bavaria.

After the militarists, aided by the Social Democrats, had stabilised their own power and that of German imperialism, they changed partners and helped Hitler to the top. Until the total defeat they remained his helpers, military planners and leaders. When certain defeat could already be seen on the horizon a small group of German militarists turned to the West and offered a common front against the Soviet Union. At the price of retaining the highest degree of

power possible for German militarism and imperialism under the conditions then prevailing, this fraction was ready to sacrifice the "Führer". This was the group which on July 20th 1944 carried out the amateurish plot against Hitler. During the actual capitulation in May 1945 Admiral Dönitz, who had been named leader by Hitler, tried to turn to the West too. In a broadcast he said:

> "Our political line is very clear... We must go along with the Western powers and work with them in the Western zones. Only by working together with them can we hope to win our lands back from the Russians later."

The German general staff who had organised and led the war could not be allowed to bear the onus of defeat. It was not the fault of the Western allies that this change of front did not go "according to plan". When today the Western powers take forcible steps to put German militarism back on its feet, then this can be described as a great victory of the conquered of yesterday over their conquerors. However, defeat awaits both of them.

The attempts made in 1944 and 1945 have provided an alibi for that part of German militarism which since 1945 has worked together with the Western powers for the reestablishment of their militarism. This does not mean, however, that the Anglo-American warmakers are getting along without the help of other German militarists. At first these people started as the modest writers of memoirs, and then raised their price ever higher as the Anglo-American warmakers needed their services more and more urgently. German imperialism was even more badly defeated in 1945 than in 1918, but the conditions for a restrengthening of German militarism were more favourable, since this time American-British imperialism is insisting on a speedy and extensive reconstruction of German militarism.

Halder and Guderian—two of Hitler's general staff chiefs in US pay

Among the first German military experts hired by the Americans were Colonel-General Franz Halder, former Chief of General Staff of the nazi Wehrmacht, and Colonel-General Heinz Guderian, who was appointed General Staff Chief by Hitler after July 20th 1944. Halder went to work for the "historical department" of the staff of the American occupation forces. With the help of the American occupation forces his book "Hitler as commander" appeared in Munich in 1949 in an edition of 100,000 copies. The book dished up again the Goebbels' lie that Hitler had attacked the Soviet Union to prevent a planned Soviet attack at the last moment. The attempt to justify Hitler's treacherous attack on the Soviet Union and his cynical breach of an international treaty is valuable today to the American warmongers. Halder's book helped the psychological preparations for the planned American attack on the Soviet Union.

Guderian, Hitler's last chief of general staff, is engaged in fabricating a new "stab in the back" legend. In a pamphlet published at the beginning of 1951 (Vohwinkel, Heidelberg) Guderian defended the point of view that "retrospectively seen" Hitler was fighting for Europe. "Our soldiers fought and fell for Europe even if they did not know it... The Western powers allied themselves in 1941 with Russia, landed in 1944 in Normandy in the rear of the

Germans and broke Germany's power as she was fighting for her very life against the Soviet Union ..." ("Schwäbische Zeitung", Leutkirch/All., April 17th 1951.)

Colonel-General Guderian was general staff officer and leader of the German tank troops in the First World War, and in the capitalist world he is regarded as one of the best tank specialists. On December 5th 1950 the West German illustrated magazine "Quick" reported:

> "Hitler's former tank general, Colonel-General Guderian, is writing his memoirs in Dietramszell (Upper Bavaria). They are mainly devoted to his experiences on the Eastern front. The American Senator McCarthy has described Guderian's descriptions of his tank experiences in the East as the Bible of the American general staff. Speaking to a 'Quick' reporter Guderian denied the rumour that he wanted to go to America."

In the meantime Guderian has visited America. The Bonn "Generalanzeiger" reported on January 25th 1951 that Guderian's flight to the United States had aroused much interest in Bonn. His trip could not have been concerned solely with routine discussions on rearmament. He flew to the United States via Cairo where he stayed three days in the US Embassy.

> "The former Colonel-General Heinz Guderian has been charged with the reactivation of the nazi secret service which was known as 'Abwehr' (counter-intelligence), the Telepress Agency reports, quoting reliable sources.
>
> Guderian has already established a framework consisting of former nazi counter-intelligence agents, Telepress reports, quoting the same sources. The Americans have transferred to Guderian the films and files of the German secret service captured by them. Guderian is at present engaged... in testing the possibilities of repairing the wrecked network once established by the secret services 'in Germany and foreign countries'...
>
> The new 'Abwehr', according to Telepress, has received the following instructions from Guderian's American bosses:
>
> (1) Guderian's secret service should infiltrate the fascist underground organisations in the European countries and work together with them.
>
> (2) Where possible the secret service should infiltrate its agents into the workers' organisations.
>
> (3) In general the secret service should try to reorganise and revive the old positions of the nazi 'Abwehr'.
>
> Allan Dulles, brother of the influential Republican politican, John Foster Dulles, is described as spiritual father of 'operation Guderian'. He is said to be a former agent of the American secret service OSS in Switzerland." ("Tägliche Rundschau", Berlin, January 20th 1951.)

Halder und Guderian are not by any means the only former leaders of the one-time general staff of the nazi Wehrmacht and German militarism who sell the Americans their military experience, and who initiate and work out war plans against the Soviet Union, hoping to win thereby a maximum strengthening of German militarism.

It is noticeable that among the former high officers of the Wehrmacht who are active in rebuilding militarism in West Germany many junker family names appear. These are names which are inseparable from the history of German militarism. Other officers represent branches of military practice regarded by the Americans as particularly desirable: tanks, the airforce, particularly fighters and special air anti-tanks units, parachutists and all forms of artillery etc.

The German general staff has officially not yet been set up. Even without its existence as an official institution however, a coordination of the many-sided endeavours to reestablish German militarism is noticeable. The "Sicherheitsamt" (security department) directly subordinated to Adenauer forms a focal point and organisational centre of an official character. This department consists of Adenauer's closest military advisers and the military experts of the German delegation to the "German-allied security committee" which negotiates in Paris on West Germany's coordination in the "West European Defence Plan".

Theodor Blank and the "Sicherheitsamt"

The "Sicherheitsamt" is headed by Theodor Blank, a CDU Member of the Bonn Parliament representing the Borken-Bocholdt constituency. An old member of the Christian trade union movement, he helped to rebuild the trade unions in 1945 on his return from a prisoner-of-war camp, and is a member of the German Trade Union Federation (DGB). In October 1950 he was named in the press as a German member of the "German-Allied Security Committee", and on October 26th 1950 Adenauer named him "representative of the Federal Government in all questions dealing with the reinforcement of allied occupation troops". This is camouflage for his real function, since only a month after taking office his department took over the work and the leading military experts of Count Schwerin's office. This office of which more will be said below, was attached to the Chancellery.

At the beginning of December, 1950, Blank gave an interview to the American agency Associated Press in which he stated: "I am not a Defence Minister as some people claim, I am a civilian holding a semi-military position." Apart from this, however, he spoke like a Minister of Defence. He emphasised "it is our duty to Germany and to Europe to create the European army quickly". Blank considered that German participation in a European army was absolutely necessary. As a condition for German participation he named complete equality "for which we shall certainly not have to wait much longer". The question of where to put troops was not very difficult: "We have enough barracks. Only the occupants are missing."

In an interview with United Press on December 3rd "Security Commissar" Theodor Blank stated that Count Schwerin's office had been completely dissolved. He had taken over some members of this office (Achim Oster, son of the former General Oster, Axel von Busche and Count Kielmannsegg) only because of their capabilities as advisers in military technical questions in connection with the billeting of reinforced Allied troops in Federal territory. ("Frankfurter Rundschau", December 4th 1950.)

In order to gauge the truth of this last statement it is necessary to know what job was officially being done by Count Schwerin up to his dismissal.

Count Schwerin—nazi general and international agent

The British weekly "New Statesman and Nation" of July 1st 1950 spoke of "Count von Schwerin, former commander of the 116th Tank Division, man behind the remilitarisation in West Germany". On September 13th 1950, the "Neue Zeitung" Munich reported:

> "The former tank general Count Gerhard Schwerin stands at the Federal Chancellor's disposal 'for advice in technical questions of security'. Thus the Federal Chancellor has chosen his security advisers from among former generals."

This had been done with the agreement of the Western occupation authorities. In this connection it is interesting to learn something of Schwerin's past from the American magazine "Newsweek" of October 2nd 1950:

> "In August 1939 General Count von Schwerin was serving on the general staff in Berlin. He got into contact with officers of the secret services of the Western powers and declared that a group of high German officers were ready to murder Hitler if the Western powers would maintain neutrality during the coming Polish campaign . . .
>
> After the armistice in 1918 Schwerin visited Poland and Rumania as the representative of an oil firm. In 1930 he made a trip through the United States and became intelligence expert for the American and British armies. In the Second World War he commanded the 116th Tank Division on the Russian front. In April 1950 Schwerin made a private visit to London—the first made by a German general—in order to discuss the reestablishment of a German army with military leaders and Conservative politicians. After the journey Adenauer invited him to give a report, and the Chancellor was pleased to find him to be a professional soldier with a clear political view."

This "ornament" of Hitler's general staff is particularly suitable for remilitarising West Germany for an American war just because of his past as an international agent of the oil magnates and foreign espionage services. His removal from office does not mean that he is not working. He had to go because he "went beyond the legal limits". The "Hamburger Abendblatt" of October 16th 1950 has this to say about his dismissal:

> "To build up a police force and 'police troops' Count Schwerin had turned to his 'grayhounds' as the men of his former division were known. He approached Admiral Gottfried Hansen and General Linde, the Chairman of the 'Bund der versorgungsberechtigten ehemaligen Wehrmachtsangehörigen und Hinterbliebenen' (Federation of ex-servicemen with pension right). These two gentlemen completely misunderstood the situation and issued a sort of regimental order which led to the entire confusion."

Schwerin was dismissed at the end of October, but his staff continues to work for Blank's office.

Speidel & Co., Ltd.

Something must be said about a number of the members of this staff. The best known are General von Speidel, General Heusinger and General Staff Colonel Count von Kielmannsegg who received their present jobs "because of their special knowledge of Russian war methods". General Heusinger was a member of the operations department of the Wehrmacht general staff in the campaign against the Soviet Union. Speidel has other qualifications which have helped him to his present office. He is "an old internationally recognised general staff officer who between the two world wars spent a long time in Britain and America, first as a military man and later as a business man". ("Aachener Nachrichten", October 10th 1950.) Speidel thus has a similar past to Schwerin. Reference must be made once again to the amnestying of Speidel's brother, the former Major-General Wilhelm Speidel. Drew Middleton stated in the "New York Times" of February 1st 1951 (see above), quite rightly that the Speidel case was "particularly interesting". The "Süddeutsche Zeitung", Munich, of February 1st 1951 gives interesting details of the release of war criminals, stating for instance:

> "Krupp's lawyers have announced that a press conference will be held at 11 a.m. While the Krupp's people are getting a champagne breakfast 'instead of flowers' from the manager of 'Goggl's' I meet Wilhelm Speidel. I want to know how he felt weeding the prison garden while his brother was conferring with the Americans on German rearmament. Speidel, fifty-six years of age, twists his lean face in a meaning grin, 'I worked most closely together with my brother in this question'. A little later the Landsberg agent of the former German general staff reports to me on weighty discussions by the Speidel brothers in the Landsberg war criminal jail. This agent produced on the spot a written memorandum to the effect that the question of the defamation of German soldierly honour could by no means be regarded as closed."

Herr Wildermuth, the Bonn Housing Minister, is a member of the German-Allied Security Committee.

> "In 1919 and 1920 he proved himself as military and police chief in combatting unrest, in the Second World War was Colonel and holder of the Knight's Cross, and thus combines police, military and political experience." ("Aachener Nachrichten", October 10th 1950.)

One asks oneself what particular qualities this counter-revolutionary from the days of the German revolutionary struggles and this former colonel, has to make him Minister of Housing. Since, however, the Bonn Ministry of Housing is occupied exclusively with the construction of officers' quarters, barracks and other military buildings he would appear to be in the right post and only his Ministry to have the wrong name.

Minister Spiecker

The German general staff does not officially exist yet, but it knows where the reserves of German militarism, scattered all over the world, live awaiting their recall. In August 1950 Dr. Spiecker, Minister of Trade of North-Rhine Westphalia, travelled as Adenauer's emissary to South America to "restore trade

relations". On January 4th 1951 the Berlin "Freie Presse" reported the following details of his journey:

> "The flower of the nazis who had fled to Buenos Aires gathered together with their Argentinian accomplices in order to stage a party in honour of Dr. Spiecker. Among those taking part were Galland, Rudel and Baumbach, well-known high ranking officers of Goering's Luftwaffe. The room was decorated with a life-size picture of Hitler, flanked with swastika banners, and on the tables were little swastika flags. The orchestra played the whole repertoire of SA music ... During his three weeks in Argentine Spiecker flew to Cordoba, Mendoza and Patagonia where thousands of nazis who escaped to Argentine are resting after their wartime adventures . . . What did he do there? From the end of October to the end of November last year more than 400 nazi war specialists direct from Argentine arrived in camp 76 near Stuttgart. They were specialists on rocket weapons and chemical warfare and former SS officers. Herr Adenauer had paid their travelling expenses against their engagement to enter the Federal army. These people were chosen by Dr. Spiecker with the benevolent support and the blessing of General Peron."

It is necessary to examine more closely the position of Argentine as a sanctuary for German war criminals and also Spiecker himself and his connections. For many decades Argentine has been an important investment field for German imperialism and a market for industrial products of all categories. German imperialism had much influence in the policy of the country and was particularly important in the army. Already after the First World War Argentine was a much frequented asylum for former officers of the Kaiser as a manoeuvre ground, particularly for military aviation which was at that time forbidden in Germany. From 1933 on nazism was in close contact with the Argentinian dictator Peron. The nazis regarded Argentine as a bridgehead against United States imperialism on the American Continent.

After the First World War Dr. Spiecker had "earned his spurs" in helping to restrengthen German militarism by his actions as the representative of the Prussian government in Upper Silesia during the clashes provoked there by the German "Freikorps" and "Schwarze Reichswehr" (two illegal military formations, trans). At that time his name was mentioned in connection with the "Feme" murders carried out in Upper Silesia. Details are given by the former General Staff Colonel Freiherr W. von Oertzen, in his book "The German Freikorps 1918—1923" published in Munich in 1936. Von Oertzen was one of the most active participants in the reconstitution and strengthening of German militarism after the First World War. Writing about Spiecker's activities in Upper Silesia he stated:

> "At the time of the bitter underground fight of the special police in Upper Silesia something arose which was later to become known as the 'Feme' . . . It was necessary to act on the spur of the moment. When one of the groups of special police received the news that someone whom one had believed to be a friend had made common cause with the Poles or done something for the French it was not possible to pin a 'Feme' summons to his door with a dagger, calling him before a 'Feme' court. Such a person had to disappear very quickly and without attracting

> attention as far as possible. He had to disappear never to return. And that happened. That happened in Upper Silesias at a time when only one question was important—German or Pole. This happened with the silent approval of the trade union leaders and Social Democratic Party officials. It happened with the agreement of Herr Severing and with the agreement of a 'Zentrum' politician like the later Ministerial Director Dr. Spiecker."

In the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the Second World War Dr. Spiecker lived as "emigrant" in France and was financed by the "Deuxième bureau" of the French general staff, the French military espionage.

The Papal Nuncio in Bonn

During his emigration in the United States during the Second World War Spiecker was in close contact with the Strasser group, the so-called "Black Front". This made him, now Minister of Trade of North-Rhine Westphalia, particularly suitable for his recruiting activities in Argentine. In addition, during his stay in the United States he had been in close contact with leading dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church, which has unusal political influence in the United States. The Vatican-Wall Street alliance is of decisive importance for United States policy in Germany. Vatican influence is partly responsible for the partitioning of Germany, since the Vatican is strongly interested in maintaining its influence in West and South Germany, areas in parts of which the Catholic population predominates. The unity of interest of the Vatican and Wall Street regarding Germany is also proved by the fact that in March, 1951, the American Archbishop Aloysius J. Muench, Bishop of Fargo, N.D., was named Papal Nuncio for Germany. Since 1945 he had headed the Vatican mission in Germany as Apostolic Visitor and Apostolic Delegate (McCloy's Quarterly Report March 31st 1951).

During the Weimar Republic the present Pope occupied the politically important post of Papal Nuncio in Germany. The position of Adenauer, a Roman Catholic, and a number of his leading collaborators from the former "Zentrum" Party, for instance Dr. Spiecker, towards the remilitarisation must undoubtedly be regarded from the point of view of Vatican influence.

The "Brotherhood" once again

The name of Rudel occurs in the report on Spiecker's journey. This is Hans-Ulrich Rudel, former Luftwaffe colonel. He is the leader of the organisation in South America known as "Kameradenwerk" which "supports needy and unemployed former soldiers and all soldiers of the former nazi Wehrmacht still imprisoned". Like similar organisations in West Germany it is a camouflaged nazi and military organisation. Rudel is undoubtedly a key figure in the reconstruction of German militarism in so far as it concerns the "reserves" in South America. Although a British warrant against him is still in force he visited West Germany in 1950 and again at the beginning of 1951. Rudel is a keen proponent of West German rearmament. In the Dürer Publishing House in Buenos Aires he has published a pamphlet entitled "Frontline soldiers on rearmament". According to a DPA despatch dated April 4th 1951 he laid claim to the following as the basis for rearmament:

> "Immediate reestablishment of full German sovereignty which would give 'a real German government' the necessary freedom of action. In addition the Western powers must make a binding promise to the German people to undertake their reunification as soon as 'the Western Allies alone are in the position to do this'. In order to encourage the German people to take up arms again the Western powers, as payment for German participation in the fight against World Bolshevism, must grant the German people the necessary 'Lebensraum' (living space) which could only lie to the East."

In the Argentinian periodical "Geopolitics" Rudel has also written about remilitarisation. In this article he claimed as the condition for German participation among other things:

> "Release of all war criminals, rehabilitation of German soldierly honour, erection of a military screen 100 divisions strong on the Eastern frontier, behind the protection of with German rearmament would be completed, reestablishment of complete sovereignty and equality." ("Welt am Sonntag", February 18th 1951.)

During Rudel's last stay in Germany—he intends to return permanently to Germany shortly—he joined the "Socialist Reichs Party," run by Remer and Dorls and also made contact with the "Brotherhood." (DPA, February 6th and 19th 1951.)

In an article in the "New Statesman and Nation" of July 1st 1950 the reporter dealt at length with the obvious signs of remilitarisation in West Germany, and had this to say about the "Brotherhood":

> "Some higher officers have active connections with the Brotherhood movement . . . There are two different motifs in the discreet but well directed propaganda of the Brotherhood. One is the demand for European union and a resultant rearmament of Germany, the other argues that Germany by its long fight in the East had saved Europe from Bolshevism . . . Some of the known leaders of the Brotherhood are of doubtful value. One of these is for instance the Chairman, a former SS-Obersturmbannführer, named Franke-Grieksch, who controls operations from Schloss Holter near Bielefeld. In 1933 he emigrated together with Otto Strasser to Prague. Later he made his peace with Himmler and, according to a report drawn up by Strasser, he spied for Himmler in the Strasser emigration. His activities in the 'Protektorat' during the war are extremely revolting. The names of other members of the Central Council of the Brotherhood are known, for instance Colonel Beck-Broichsitter, former I. A. of the elite tank division 'Greater Germany'; connected with it are the Generals Natzmer and Giller, Kaufmann, former Gauleiter of Hamburg and—despite his denials—the former Commander of the Division 'Greater Germany' Lieutenant General von Manteuffel."

The "Brotherhood" is interesting particularly as one of the associations of high ranking officers which have arisen as driving forces in the rearmament of West Germany. In May 1950 for example General von Manteuffel approached the representatives of the three leading Western powers as spokesman of the "Brotherhood" with a memorandum on speedy remilitarisation of West Germany.

6. The German shocktroops — the lost contingent in the American war

Any attempt to give a survey of the position of remilitarisation in West Germany must distinguish between firstly the stage reached in discussions between the representatives of Bonn and the Western powers and secondly the stage reached in the actual organisation of both legal and "black" rearmament. The development of the discussions in the first question during the first seven months of 1951 and their general trend can be shown from press comments. The same course can be followed in the second question but the manifold forms of camouflage, particularly of the "black remilitarisation", make it almost impossible to give an inclusive survey.

The negotiations between Bonn and the Western powers

On January 9th 1951 the discussions began on the Petersberg between Bonn and the Western powers about the participation of West Germany in the Atlantic Pact forces.

> "Those taking part were John A. Ward, British Deputy High Commissioner; General G. P. Hays, and B. P. Buttenwieser, United States Deputy High Commissioners; A. Bérard, French Deputy High Commissioner, General J. Ganeval and Major-General Lloyd Wansbrough-Jones. The German delegation was led by Theodor Blank, Federal government representative for the billeting of Allied occupation troops. The other members of the delegation were the former generals Hans Speidel and Adolf Heusinger, and Herr Blank's collaborators Count Kielmannsegg and Ernst Ostermann." ("Die Neue Zeitung", Munich, January 16th 1951.)

On January 25th the "Kasseler Zeitung" reported that in connection with the trip to Germany of General Eisenhower and the American special representative for armaments, Cooper:

> "The Germans had handed the allied military experts a detailed plan on remilitarisation which included exact plans for recruiting and organising the future German units.
>
> "It is reported that the age groups born in 1927 to 1933 will be called up first of all for service in the German Atlantic contingent. The call-up and recruiting regulations were patterned closely on the American model while the organisational methods followed the pattern of the former German Reichswehr. The new German Army Law was ready down to the last dot. From remarks made by the German military advisers, General Speidel and General Heusinger, it appears that in the secret military conferences which are following one another almost continuously in view of the Eisenhower visit, the allies are making extremely high demands with regard to the number of German troops, their qualitative selection and the date for beginning remilitarisation. German experts believe that the allied conditions can only be fulfilled on the basis of conscription. The Americans are said to be interested in well trained healthy young recruits aged between 18 and 24, as well as specialists up to the age of 35."

Discussions are being held in Paris parallel to those in Bonn. The first meeting opened in the middle of February.

> "The French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman opened the Paris Conference on the formation of a European army. A German delegation . . . led by Secretary of State Professor Walter Hallstein, took part. It consisted of Dr. von Mangold, head of the German Mission to the OEEC, and Ulrich de Mezière, former Lieutenant-General from the German general staff. Geheimrat Konrad Rödiger was appointed permanent chief deputy of the German delegation." (McCloy's quarterly report March 31st 1951.)

The reason for the parallel negotiations is that the United States is insisting on the most rapid and inclusive rearmament of West Germany and that France for "reasons of security" vis à vis her German ally wishes to confine her contribution within such limits that the military superiority of France will be ensured. The vital question is thus the size of the West German unit and the question of command. The French "solution" is a different one from the American. The Washington correspondent of "Le Monde" showed this clearly in a report on June 21st 1951 in which he stated:

> "Washington has been watching the technical discussions in Paris without much enthusiasm. It is believed here that the future French government . . . will be better able to consider the problem in connection with the plan which has been approved by the allied and German military experts.
> The plan foresees the creation of twelve German divisions forming four army corps, including one tank corps composed of three divisions. The other nine divisions — three army corps — should be made up of infantry units with the other necessary units: tank battalions, pioneer units, general staff, military police, medical supply and administrative units. The inclusion in the 'United Atlantic Forces' would take place, according to this plan, only in groups of the strength of regimental fighting units of divisional strength, as proposed in September last year. It is undoubtedly true that McCloy stated in Washington that the Germans were not in any great hurry to mobilise for the welfare of Europe. There are, however, grounds for believing that the goodwill of the Adenauer government depends above all on the conditions of the planned remilitarisation. It is exactly these conditions that play an important part in the discussions of the American High Commissioner with the relevant civilian and military authorities in Washington.
>
> Do they hope to spur on the French government by raising the French contribution to Western defence to 80 divisions at war strength — that is twice the number of the German divisions which it is planned to create, arm and train by the end of 1953? This appears to be not impossible . . ."

The "Times", London stated on June 27th that the conversations between the German military representatives, the Generals Speidel and Heusinger and the Allied High Commissioners which had been taking place since January in Bonn at regular intervals were now completed. Reports had been submitted to the respective governments. It should be noted that the report speaks of "air and naval units" in the proposals on "the size and organisation of a German military

contribution". The "Times", reporting on the Paris discussions on the Pleven plan, stresses that Franco-German differences in the question of the West German contribution to the European army had not yet been overcome. Not without the intention of blackmailing France the "Times" stated:

> "It is obvious that a long road still lies ahead of us before any German contribution will be made to Western defence. The final consent of the Federal government in Bonn is in no way certain in view of the antimilitaristic views of broad sections of public opinion in West Germany."

In the meantime the remilitarisation of West Germany has been driven further ahead by the American slave driver McCloy. On his return from a trip to Washington to receive orders he declared, after a talk with Adenauer and Schumacher, at a press conference in Bonn on July 13th that the most important problem for the United States at the moment was the moblisation of West Germany for the fight against the East. The conclusion of the Schuman plan and the extensive prevention of East-West trade should be regarded as an acknowledgement by the West German separatist state of the necessity of "Western defence". McCloy, referring to the wishes of the German imperialists, stated that he fully understood that they wanted to represent their point of view even more strongly and promised them that the question of their "equality" would solve itself when West German was rearmed. Even more outspoken were the Deputy United States High Commissioner, General G. P. Hays, and his adjutant Lieutenant-Colonel Gerhardt about the American intention to force West German remilitarisation at any price and to overcome French opposition. At one of the weekly situation conferences in American headquarters in Paris attended by General Speidel and Colonel Oster, the military representatives of Bonn, Hays promised the West German representatives at the beginning of July that the United States did not intend to tolerate French resistance to German remilitarisation any longer. Lieutenant-Colonel Gerhardt expressed himself with even more brutal frankness when he told the German generals: "We don't intend to stand for you being laced up in the Pleven corset. In September at the latest we shall conclude an Atlantic Military Statute with you." On July 12th "Die Welt", issued by the British occupation authorities, reported under the headline "Americans press for speed" on a journey made by McCloy to Paris and London to break French resistance. If it was not possible "to coordinate the German-Allied military talks on the Petersberg with the Paris discussions, other American measures in this question would have to be reckoned with." In view of this state of affairs no further explanation is needed for the armaments programme of the German militarists in Bonn which became known on July 13th. Adenauer's "military experts" proposed for a start (!) 250,000 men organised in six army corps as the "central demand" of German remilitarisation. For this purpose conscription and a two year term of service should be introduced. A tactical airforce with, for a start, (!) 2,000 modern fighters and bombers should be staffed by 40,000 men. These demands were forwarded to the High Commissioners by the Bonn government in a memorandum 40 pages long.

The organisational stage reached by remilitarisation

In the course of the years the Anglo-American warmakers have been furnished with a number of rearmament plans by German military experts, some of them on order and some of them voluntarily proffered. The best known of these experts were Guderian, Halder, Count Schwerin and Manteuffel. The plans have to some extent been superseded by events but for many months the figures of 200,000 to 250,000 have always recurred, making it possible to judge the extent of the first stage in rearmament. The plans have a certain interest too in the fact that they show how the "German general staff" has been able to enforce its general line.

On October 27th 1950 the French newspaper "Le Monde" quoted the following details from an interview with Count Schwerin, who at that time was still Adenauer's military adviser:

> "The Allies would demand from the Germans as a b a s i s o f t h e m o b i l i s a t i o n the formation of ten divisions, that is to say about 200,000 men in peacetime. I n t h e c a s e o f w a r W e s t G e r m a n y c o u l d m o b i l i s e 3.5 m i l l i o n m e n taking into consideration war industry, according to calculations made by the 'small German general staff' (Petit état major allemand) led by Count Schwerin but it would be necessary to establish the staffs immediately. This army of ten divisions would have to be above all a motorised tank army."

In the meantime the demands have been somewhat raised and the figures named on July 13th 1951 will be further increased. In the Washington report in "Le Monde" of June 21st 1951 already quoted the figure of 40 divisions is set for West Germany by 1953. These upward alterations are interesting in so far as they show that the American "war bosses" have no time to lose. The more divisions raised today the more chance there is of quickly mobilising the 3.5 million men available for military duty in West Germany, a figure which is too low rather than too high. The references to raising the figure in years to come should not be allowed to conceal the fact that a rapid mobilisation is absolutely possible. Britain and the United States up to the First World war and between the two world wars had only a limited army of professional soldiers and no general conscription, but in both wars they were able to establish mass armies within a very short period. With the cadres already forming military units in West Germany today and the many trained age groups with war experience upon whom to fall back, a mobilisation could be carried out very quickly after the introduction of conscription. For this it would be necessary, however, to break the resistance of the population of West Germany. All these factors have been taken into account in the rearmament plans discussed between Bonn and the Western powers. It is important to emphasise that no one should allow himself to be misled by dates alleging a long term programme of rearmament. No one should allow himself to be misled about the scale of the rearmament by the figures of 200,000 to 300,000 men which have been so often repeated. That is only the groundwork, the first step of rearmament. When conscription has once been introduced — and that will be the next surprise stroke by the West German separatist state — the decisive step will have been taken, providing a "legal" basis for a West German mass army.

The organisation and distribution of this army is closely patterned on that of the former Wehrmacht. Colonel-General Halder, former Wehrmacht Chief of general staff, worked out in the summer of 1950 a plan for the creation of a full scale Wehrmacht for the American high command in Germany. According to this plan West Germany would be divided into nine military districts and the same number of army corps.

The army corps would be distributed as follows:

Military Distract	Composition
Münster i. W.	3 infantry divisions, half a tank division
Stuttgart	3 infantry divisions
Munich	2 infantry divisions, 1 brigade
Würzburg	2 infantry divisions
Nuremberg	2 infantry divisions, 1 tank division
Kassel	3 infantry divisions, 1 tank division
Hamburg	3 infantry divisions
Hanover	3 infantry divisions
Wiesbaden	3 infantry divisions
Total	24 infantry divisions, $2^1/_2$ tank divisions and 1 brigade mountain troops

The plan also foresees the establishment of an Air Ministry which would control military and civil air transport. For air transport purposes West Germany would be divided into four military districts with their centres in Münster, Munich, Kiel and Brunswick.

Conscription would be reintroduced. The officers would be selected solely by the High Command. In order to ensure new officer material officers' schools would be established in Hanover and Munich for infantry, engineers and signals. Active service in all branches should last for two years.

General Halder proposed to carry out his plan in three stages:

(1) Call-up of 25,000 instructors who should have a six months' military refresher course and make themselves familiar with their future duties.

(2) Creation of recruiting agencies with instructors for the various military districts.

(3) General call-up and formation of units.

("Les partisans de la paix", Paris, No. 15, September 1950.)

Remilitarisation in West Germany is now reaching the third phase of Halder's plan.

Various means are being used to camouflage the formation of cadres, which is demanded as the first condition in all rearmament plans drawn up by German experts. After the defeat of German imperialism in 1918 the dissolved German general staff devoted its main attention to holding together military cadres. That was von Seeckt's basic idea in founding the Reichswehr. In addition the foundation was laid for a later mass army by providing elementary military training and ideological and organisational preparations in the Freikorps and various citizens' and students' guard units, in the "Schwarze Reichswehr" which developed from the Freikorps and later in paramilitary organisations such as the Stahlhelm, Werwolf, SA and SS and even the Republican Reichsbanner.

The basis idea of remilitarisation in West Germany as far as the German militarists are concerned is the same as that followed by von Seeckt. The speed with which cadres are being formed and the movement towards a mass army has, however, been "Americanised". No obstacles were put in the way of the preparations for a "black" rearmament in West Germany. Soon ofter the defeat in 1945 various "benevolent" federations of former soldiers and "dependents" were established. They were followed by "emergency associations", mutual assistance groups, camouflaged regimental and divisional associations (for instance General Schwerin's "Grayhounds", and General Student's Parachutists), Werwolves, Stahlhelm, "Technische Nothilfe" (strikebreaking organisation) and similar bodies. According to a United Press message from Bonn in January 1951 a "First Legion" had been set up in the territory of the West German separatist state with a membership of 100,000 young Germans. This list of organisations is by no means complete and gives little idea of their scope. It is, however, necessary to indicate their presence and their importance in the psychological preparations for rearmament and also to draw the parallel to the "black" rearmament in the Weimar Republic. The toleration and support for these organisations is characteristic of the fascist tendencies of the Bonn state in which there is no war party to the right of Adenauer. Adenauer makes use of the rightist parties and groups no less than he uses Schumacher's "opposition". Both the SS division "Greater Germany" and the parachutists have declared their support for Adenauer. In the West German separatist state the switch over from "black" to "legal" rearmament is taking place far faster than in the Weimar Repubic.

Police as cadre organisation for a mass army

The "legal" cadre organisations for the planned mass army are the police formations, particularly the police alert squads and the frontier police decided on by the Bonn Parliament on February 15th 1951. Although Minister of the Interior Lehr (CDU), claims that these formations have only been created to guard internal security their real purpose becomes obvious from their tasks, composition, armament and training as military units. In addition the "Federal police" is regarded as the cadre organisation for the planned mass army in the rearmament plans of the German military experts including Guderian.

> "The total strength of the police in the Federal Republic will amount to 90,000 ordinary police in the various provinces, a first instalment of 10,000 men in alert squads (to be increased to 30,000 following the New York decisions) and 10,000 men in the Federal frontier police, according to a spokesman of the Ministry of the Interior." ("Die Welt", February 10th 1951.)

According to the Minister of the Interior, Lehr, speaking at an Evangelical Church rally for men in Dusseldorf on May 25th, the alert squads will have the task in the American aggression plans of "securing the rear of the foreign garrisons" and "preserving law and order".

> "On November 21th 1950 Anton Grasser, newly appointed Inspector General of the so-called 'alert squads' organised by Adenauer on McCloy's orders, took up his post. The former Hitler general naturally tried to deny and gloss over the military character of the new alert police when he met the press for the first time.

The military character of the new formations may be seen from their armament, consisting of pistols, rifles, machine-pistols, machine-guns, and 'overland vehicles'. These will later be supplemented by mortars and mine-throwers. The weapons have to be bought from American arms factories —America did not want to lose this bit of business — and that naturally demands foreign exchange. The alert squads have a new uniform too, coloured 'dark mountain troop green'. One quarter of the alert squads are to stand-by continuously in the provinces. If Adenauer should declare the existence of a so-called 'state of emergency' the Inspector General will automatically become Commander and will have unlimited power of command in the entire 'Federal territory'.

These remarks made by General Grasser and his collaborator, Herr von Egidi, at the press conference show quite clearly that it is intended to use the new military formations against the German people in the first place." ("Tägliche Rundschau", November 22nd 1950.)

The alert police has become a happy hunting ground for former SS leaders.

"On 23rd January the Executive Committee of the SPD published sensational material on the political guilt of the men being trained in the police schools of Hanoversch-Minden and Trauenstein as candidates for leading positions in the alert police. Out of 52 taking part in a course at Hanoversch-Minden 52 were politically severely incriminated. No fewer than 20 of the 25 taking part in the Trauenstein course were politically incriminated. For instance 'W. A.' from Mannheim had been a member of the SS since 1931, SS Sturmbannführer, and holder of the Death's Head Ring and the Dagger of Honour of the SS.

'A. A.' was holder of the Golden Badge of the Hitler Youth, he held the rank of an Obersturmführer in the SS and the rank of a Hauptsturmführer in the Waffen SS.

'E. A.' from Fürth had been an SS Sturmbannführer; 'W. A,' from Duisburg SS Hauptsturmführer; 'W. B.' from Rockensüss SS Sturmführer. 'W. B.' from Berlin had held the rank of SS Obersturmbannführer, and was I. A. to the chief of the anti-bandit units. (Nazi term for Wehrmacht units employed in fighting partisans and resistance groups. ed.)

'H. D.' was SS Sturmbannführer; 'H. F.' from Wiesbaden held the same rank. As member of the Waffen SS 'F. G.' from Hanover held the rank of SS Obersturmbannführer. 'J. K.' from Lebach held the rank of SS Hauptsturmführer and carried out leading SS and police functions in the Eighth army district. 'B. K.' from Düsseldorf was a member of the staff of the Reichsführer of the SS Personal Hauptamt (chief staff office) and was a Hauptsturmführer." ("Hamburger Echo", January 24th 1951.)

On February 16th 1951 the Bonn Minister of the Interior, Lehr, stated in a press conference that in case of emergency the frontier police, approved by Parliament on February 15th, could be used in accordance with article 91 of the Basic Law, that is to say not solely in frontier areas. The position was thus the same as with regard to the units of the provincial alert police put at his disposal by administrative agreement.

Dr. Lehr stated that of the approved 10,000 men for the frontier police one man would be regularly employed guarding each one and a half kilometres (about 1 mile) of frontier. It was, therefore, necessary to station the units in barracks in order to create rallying points for concentrated action. The frontier police would have police powers, be highly motorised and equipped with radio. The weapons to be provided in the near future included German requisitioned rifles borrowed from French stocks together with a "certain quantity" of German machineguns from the same source. Machine pistols and pistols would have to be bought on the open market. ("Hamburger Echo", February 17th 1951.)

> On July 4th Dr. Lehr told journalists in Bonn: "that a motion would shortly be brought before Parliament for an increase in the numbers of the frontier forces from 10,000 to 20,000 men. There were grounds for fearing that the 10,000 men strong alert police squads for Germany decided by the New York Foreign Ministers' Conference could not be set up in time because of the difficulties arising from the fact that a change of the constitution would be necessary. *The Federal government was therefore desirous of using to the full the 30,000 men quota for the frontier police approved by the Foreign Ministers.*" ("Die Neue Zeitung", Berlin edition, July 5th 1951.)

The so-called "provincial police" of the Bonn separatist state also have a distinctly military character.

On March 5th 1951 the "Neues Deutschland" made sensational disclosures on the training of the West Berlin police as a military offensive unit. "Very secret" service regulations of the Berlin police administration, Ref. No. DV Nr. 5, which had come into the possession of the newspaper showed clearly that the West Berlin police were being systematically armed and drilled for war. At the same time the Western police were being systematically trained as a civil war unit because of American fears of strikes and anti-remilitarisation demonstrations in West Berlin.

This document, DV Nr. 5, was based on the regulations of the former state police of the nazi period, particularly on part II of the arms manual of the state police and also on the army regulations of the Hitler Wehrmacht. Some paragraphs of these regulations were taken over word for word.

The document DV Nr. 5 contains exact instructions on house to house fighting, the preparation of defence positions in houses, the tactical use of the position and character of single buildings and built up areas, the use of hand grenades and explosive charges, observational exercises and "target description" exercises as well as instructions for "scouting service" to be carried out in civilian clothes and equipped with false papers.

DV Nr. 5 also includes war training instructions taken over from the former Wehrmacht in the paragraphs entitled "III The Group, IV The Platoon, V The Company, VI Scouting and training, VII Training in technical work, VIII Badges of rank and unit badges. For the "alert squads" training on "heavy weapons" is planned in addition to machine gun training. The armament is that of infantry equipped for war. Each group has a machine gun, three machine pistols, six rifles and ten pistols. Hand grenades will be provided in unlimited quantities. In addition the police are equipped with entrenching tools, clearance tools, etc.

The long paragraphs of DV Nr. 5 on "training in the use of irritants" are training regulations for a gas war.

Former officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the Hitler police and the Hitler army have been and are being constantly recruited in the West Berlin police in order to ensure rapid training of the police, recently greatly strengthened, on the basis of these regulations. In order to "increase the reliability" of the West police as troops for civil war and offensive war all police have been ruthlessly fired who did not wish to submit to the detailed "refascisation" laid down in the official regulations.

"Labour Units"—a camouflaged army

For years the Western occupation powers have been tapping West German manpower for their military purposes quite independently of the rearmament measures taken by German quarters in West Germany. This action has continued up to the present in the form of "recruitment" for the Foreign Legions of various states. More important, however, are the so-called "Labour Units" of the American and British occupation authorities which have grown to real armies of mercenaries.

> "United States Army Headquarters have denied rumours that the Labour Companies and units of Industrial Police are 'a camouflaged army'. The total strength of Labour Companies is at present 30,000 men.
>
> The majority of the men are Germans, about 60 % former soldiers including former Wehrmacht generals. The former Lieutenant-General Gustav von Varst, who served under Rommel in Africa is with the Labour Companies in Nuremberg, former General Gerhard Matzky, former corps commander in the East is 'Liaison officer' at United States Headquarters. (General Matzky has in the meantime been named Commander of the frontier police. ed.) In addition the former Generals von Schlieben, Paul Mahlmann and former generals of the Luftwaffe hold the ranks of Majors in the Labour Companies. One general, whose name has not been disclosed, is serving as a non-commissioned officer. According to the announcement from United States Headquarters these generals are not allowed to carry out military exercises or prepare to convert the Labour Companies into a 'German army'." ("Nürnberger Nachrichten", Nuremberg, October 23rd 1950.)

This dementi is disproved by a statement published in the "Westdeutsche Allgemeine" of May 30th 1951, a paper which has very close connections with the Petersberg, according to which the so-called German labour units (German Service Organisation) has been changed openly into an army. In the 85 camps of the GSO a "proclamation of the Army of the Rhine"—a contract for mercenaries—was read to the German serving men. According to this proclamation the Labour units, as the "Westdeutsche Allgemeine" reported, were "converted into units organised on the lines of the Wehrmacht". They are now divided into units on a military pattern and the titles of rank have been militarised. Newly joined persons are now called "recruits" as they used to be. This "order of the day" scarcely came as a surprise for the 35,000 GSO men, 16,000 in Lower Saxony, 13,000 in North-Rhine Westphalia and 6,000 in Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein. They knew that since autumn 1950 the

word "civil" had been crossed out in their contract and that the word "labour" had been replaced by "service".

Something new is the order that the German mercenaries will not in future be used only in the British occupation area as hitherto but that on American orders they can be used all over West Germany.

> "General Speidel had sometime expressed himself as being very annoyed at the 'cold remilitarisation' carried out in the American and British zones through the formation of large units of industrial police and guard companies. It is reported that these formations will be reinforced by units of the former Vlassov army and displaced persons. Political observers in Bonn calculate their total strength at already 125,000 men. There are reports of camouflaged foreign legions removed from German command. It is to be assumed that the allies are purposely pushing ahead the establishment of the industrial police and similar formations because official rearmament has met with unexpectedly strong opposition from the Germans." ("Kasseler Zeitung", Kassel, February 23rd 1951.)

According to a report of the "Neue Zeitung," Munich-Berlin, dated December 13th 1950 "Labour Units" have started their work in West Berlin. "This was announced by the headquarters of the American garrison in Berlin on Tuesday."

The figure quoted by the "Kasseler Zeitung" is certainly not too high. At the end of April 1950 the Department of Information of the German Democratic Republic, basing itself on exact information, announced that the strength of these labour units war 107,400 in the American zone and 80,000 in the British zone. Even 125,000 German mercenaries in foreign service on German soil constitute a menace to peace and the unity of Germany.

Naval rearmament

After the establishment of the mercenary army at the end of May 1951 it became known from Bonn that a high command for the mercenary navy called "Frontier Guard—Sea Section" had been established at Neustadt/Holstein in the Bay of Lübeck. For a start this naval base will have three flotillas at its disposal. A training flotilla will be transferred to the war port of Wilhelmshaven.

The first four companies of the West German mercenary navy should be ready for action by August. This was reported from the Bonn Ministry of the Interior on May 29th 1951. The companies will be based on Kiel and Lübeck. That is a step towards the naval rearmament of West Germany. This was nothing new as the following report confirms:

> "Four 600 ton mine sweepers of the nazi navy have been put into service by the American Naval Authorities in Bremerhaven with German crews. The first ship with 72 German officers and men on board has already put to sea under US command. The training of the German sailors follows the American pattern and concentrates particularly on sweeping passages through mine fields for large naval units.
>
> "The German minesweeper flotilla is for the time being a part of the so-called Sea Labour Units set up by the Americans. American officers have, however, indicated that the naval units will later form part of the Eisenhower army under a central German command.

"The German sailors are subject to American military law and have agreed to serve everywhere, also outside German waters.

"The British officials have raised similar naval units made up of German sailors.

"On February 10th 1951 it became known in Bremerhaven that the former nazi Admirals Helmut Heye and Friedrich Ruge were working out operational plans for naval warfare in the coastal areas of the North Sea and the Baltic on the orders of the American Naval Authorities." ("Neue Zeit", Berlin, February 11th 1951.)

Civil Defence and security zones

"Dr. Lehr informed the cabinet yesterday that the Federal Ministry of the Interior which was already considering the question of reintroducing a civilian air raid defence system had also taken up the question of establishing so-called 'security zones' as laid down in the 1949 version of the Geneva Convention. Parties to this Convention or states at war can establish security and hospital zones on their own or occupied territory in which the wounded, the sick and children can be protected from the results of the war.

The Ministry of the Interior is also considering the formation of an emergency service of technicians probably in the form of a public society. In this connection it was stated that such a formation would not be used for the purpose of breaking strikes." ("Hamburger Echo", January 9th 1951.)

It has been possible to give an extensive but by no means complete picture of the stage reached by remilitarisation in West Germany. A complete picture could only be given by somebody working in the American staff or in the "German general staff," someone through whose hands all the threads of West German remilitarisation run. These are the people who do all they can to prevent the German people, whom they are driving through remilitarisation to war and thus to their destruction as a nation, from knowing how far rearmament has gone. Here an attempt has been made to draw attention to the speed of the preparations for war in West Germany and to give some impression of the stage reached. This compilation is intended as a serious appeal for resistance against those who want to destroy our nation. The types of weapons granted to the Germans in West Germany and the way in which they are being organised throw light on the way they are expected to be used. There are tanks, artillery of all calibres, fighter planes, mine sweeping flotillas and armoured mechanised mobile units organised in divisional strength of 10,000 men, units which according to the views of "experienced Eastern front fighters" are the right size for carrying out tasks independently. The Wall Street strategists want a new German mass army, German shock troops as the lost contingents of American war. German strategists of defeat in two world wars, gamblers who have so little conscience that they are ready to put the very existence of the German nation at stake, give their help. All of them fear only one thing: the resistance of the great majority of the German people, the force which, together with all peace-loving peoples of the world, can prevent American war in Europe and thus a third world war.

VI.

THE GERMAN PEOPLE FIGHT FOR NATIONAL UNITY AND AGAINST WAR

1. Unity for a democratic, peace-loving Germany—the condition for peace 167

Decision on the existence of the German nation 167 / The National Front of Democratic Germany 168 / The formation of the German Democratic Republic 169 / Grotewohl's letter and the Volkskammer offer 170

2. Unity of government and people 171

The attitude towards peace: a criterion for every German 171 / Appeal for national resistance 172

3. Resistance in West Germany 172

Workers and generals 172 / "After all I have four children" 173 / "A revival of German militarism is the death sentence for democracy 174 / The development from "Ohne uns" to resistance 174 / The fight of the West German workers 175 / Peasants defend their fields 176 / "The Christian task of the day" 178 / For neutrality—against remilitarisation 179 / Youth in the forefront 179 / Youth act against demolitions 180 / Courts oppose Adenauer 181 / Clear answer to the policy of war 181

4. Plebiscite throughout Germany 182

Illegal ban on plebiscite in West Germany 182 / Twenty different plebiscite polls—one result 183 / Private polls show overwhelming majority against remilitarisation 184 / Remilitarisation is rejected in Munich just as in Berlin 185 / Plebiscite in the German Democratic Republic 187

5. A severe blow 189

6. The German people are not alone 191

Peace can be maintained 193

1. Unity for a democratic peace-loving Germany — the condition for peace

Decision on the existence of the German nation

The overwhelming majority of the German people desire neither the remilitarisation of Germany nor a new war. They want the restoration of the unity of their country and a lasting peace. They want a peace treaty and the withdrawal of occupation troops. They want a peace loving, democratic and free Germany.

The American imperialists know this well. But above all the German imperialists know it well, the German imperialists who are taking part as allies and agents of the American monopolists in the crime of preparing a third world war, a war against the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic.

For this war, however, they need the active assistance of the majority of the population of West Germany. They need the working people to produce weapons, munitions and military equipment, to transport troops and material, to keep the wheels of industry turning. They need the youth of West Germany as cannon fodder, they need Germany as a theatre of war. If the population of West Germany refuses to pay allegiance to them the American war in Europe cannot take place.

Recent events prove that the German people are becoming increasingly aware of their responsibility for their own destiny and the peace of the world.

The American imperialists and their German puppets have discovered that they cannot overcome the German people's desire for peace by fraud and slander. For this reason they have stepped-up police terror. For this reason the most important democratic principles have been arbitrarily suspended. Personal freedom has been abolished, in so far as it existed, and all those who oppose the criminal preparation of American war have been persecuted with nazi methods, by bans, by deprivation of the means of livelihood, by terroristic verdicts and terms of imprisonment.

Despite this terror, despite all the slanders and the frauds, the resistance of the West German population is growing. In their fight to safeguard national existence and peace they receive strong support and active assistance from the population, the parties and last but not least from the government of the German Democratic Republic, all of whom struggle with all their strength against remilitarisation and war and for the unity of Germany and peace.

As has been shown Germany was partitioned by the Anglo-American imperialists in order that they could use West Germany and its reserves of men and material as main base for the American war against the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic. They wanted the help of revived German imperialism too in making other West European countries tractable for their war. These American war plans rely on the maintenance and deepening of the split through Germany. The formation of a united, democratic and peace-loving Germany, foreseen in the Potsdam Agreement, and desired by the great majority of the German people, would foil

these plans of war and save Germany and the German people from destruction in a third world war. The fight for the unity of Germany is therefore an important part of the fight for peace, the result of which will decide the fate of the German nation.

The National Front of Democratic Germany

The fight for German unity is led by peace-loving and patriotic Germans from all parts of the country and all sections of the population who have come together to form the National Front of Democratic Germany. The peace-loving and patriotic forces of the German Democratic Republic have a particularly important part to play in the National Front. This is only natural since the German Democratic Republic is the only part of Germany is which every German is able to give his free and unfettered support for German unity and for peace. It is the only part of Germany in which the imperialist and militarist forces have been destroyed and extirpated.

The National Front of Democratic Germany grew out of the People's Congress Movement for Unity and Just Peace which from the date of its birth at the end of 1947 led a determined fight against partitioning, and in favour of German unity and the speedy conclusion of a peace treaty based on the Potsdam decisions. The People's Congress Movement for Unity and Just Peace was strongly supported by the peace-loving people and patriots not only of the then Soviet occupation zone and Berlin but also of West Germany. For this reason it was persecuted from the first with police terror by the imperialist Western powers and their German assistants Adenauer and Schumacher, who saw that it threatened their plans to split Germany and reestablish German imperialism. The People's Congress Movement aroused tens of thousands of Germans in West Germany and brought them into the ranks of those who fight for the unity of Germany and a just and lasting peace. The Presidium of the German People's Council, the permanent body of the People's Congress Movement, addressed an appeal to the governments of the great powers as an answer to the notorious "London recommendations" of June 8th 1948. These London recommendations marked the beginning of a new and decisive stage in the criminal policy of the Western powers of splitting Germany. The appeal stated in part:

> "In the Potsdam Declaration the Allies gave their pledge that the aim of their policy was to work together to create and maintain the economic and political unity of a democratic Germany.
>
> The London 'recommendations' completely contradict this formal international obligation which through its character as international law embodies a legal claim on the part of the German people."

The "London recommendations" brought the danger of a complete partitioning of Germany very close.

In view of the increasing seriousness of the national emergency the framework of the People's Congress Movement showed itself to be too constricted. In order to make it possible for all responsible Germans from the East and the West, despite all differences of opinion, to join together in the question of German unity, vital for the German people, the Third German People's Congress, meeting in Berlin on May 29th and 30th 1949, constituted the National Front of Democratic Germany.

Speaking at the Eighth Session of the German People's Council in Berlin on July 23rd 1949, Wilhelm Pieck, today President of the German Democratic Republic, defined the National Front in these words:

> "The proposal to form the National Front arose as the result of the new situation thus created in Germany, the increased danger of the national oppression of the German people and of a new war being provoked. This front should also embrace those sections of the German people who up to now have not joined the German People's Congress Movement or who even opposed it because of its organisational form and its democratic basis . . .
>
> No conditions are put (for working with the National Front, ed.) other than that they should be ready to fight against Amerian imperialism for the national independence of the German people." (Wilhelm Pieck: Speeches and articles, vol. II, Berlin 1950, p. 256/257, German edition.)

The formation of the German Democratic Republic

The formation of the West German separatist government on September 20th 1949, completing the partitioning of Germany by the imperialist Western powers, created a new situation which called for immediate measures by the democratic parties and mass organisations. The formation of the Provisional Government of the German Democratic Republic was such a measure. The Manifesto issued by the German People's Council on October 7th 1949 in connection with the establishment of the German Democratic Republic, entitled "The National Front of Democratic Germany", stated:

> "Since the call for the formation of the National Front of Democratic Germany at the 3rd German People's Congress the struggle of the patriotic forces of the German people against the partitioning of Germany has assumed more and more the character of a broad people's movement.
>
> The state of national emergency into which the German people have been plunged by the breach of the Potsdam Agreement by the imperialist Western powers is a clarion call to all Germans to struggle for the noble aim:
>
> The creation of a united, independent, democratic Germany with a view to the speedy conclusion of a just peace treaty with Germany and the withdrawal of all occupation troops within a short period.
>
> For four and a half years the guns have been silent. The expectations of the German people that they would obtain economic and political unity, that a new democratic and anti-militarist Germany would be established and that a peace treaty would be concluded as formally promised by the Potsdam Agreement have been disappointed. Germany has been partitioned through the imperialist policy of the Western powers. The Ruhr and the Saar have been torn from the German economic structure. The German people have been refused a peace treaty. Instead of this, in the Western zones, an Occupation Statute, intended to extend the occupation indefinitely, has been forced upon them."

After explaining the aims of the National Front of Democratic Germany, first of which is the reestablishment of the political and economic unity of Germany the Manifesto stated:

"German men and women, German youth! The German Democratic Republic has been created in the German capital Berlin by the unanimous will of all parties and mass organisations in the German People's Council on the basis of the constitution confirmed by the 3rd German People's Congress. The foremost endeavour of the constitutionally formed provisional German government will be the fight for peace and for the unity and sovereignty of Germany. It will be an important bastion in the fight to put into effect the programme of the National Front of Democratic Germany.

We call on the German people to take the salvation of the nation into their own hands and by supporting the fight of the National Front of Democratic Germany to clear the road for peace, construction and the national freedom of the united German Democratic Republic. Long live the National Front of Democratic Germany!"

Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl in his government declaration quoted above emphasised the unshakable will of the democratic forces of the German people to overcome their national plight and to take their destiny into their own hands. He declared:

"The source of our strength is the National Front of Democratic Germany which is striving to unite all honest Germans in the fight for the national aims held by all."

Grotewohl's letter and the Volkskammer offer

Since that date the government of the German Democratic Republic has pursued undeviatingly the aim of creating a united, peace-loving and democratic Germany and maintaining peace. On November 30th 1950, in pursuit of these great aims, Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl proposed to Federal Chancellor Dr. Adenauer the opening of immediate negotiations for the creation of an all-German Constituent Council which should prepare the formation of an all-German provisional government.

"Large sections of the population in East and West Germany believe that the next step to be taken to solve the vital national questions of our people is to submit a joint German proposal to the four occupation powers. The government of the German Democratic Republic, basing itself on this desire of the peace-loving population submits to the government of the Federal Republic the proposal to open negotiations between the two governments on the establishment of an all-German Constituent Council. We propose that each government should name six representatives for this purpose." (From the letter sent by Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl on November 30th 1950.)

Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl proposed that the all-German Constituent Council should support the governments of the USSR, USA, Great Britain and France in working out a peace treaty for Germany. If necessary a plebiscite should be held to allow the German people to vote on these proposals.

The general approval with which Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl's letter to Dr. Adenauer was greeted in all parts of Germany, particularly in West Ger-

many, proved that the proposal was in line with the desire of the German people in East and West. At first Adenauer tried by the use of phrases to avoid giving the letter serious consideration but the storm of public protest in West Germany forced him to submit the letter to his cabinet for discussion. The proposed agreement was sharply rejected. The people of West Germany, however, did not agree with this rejection. 37 members of the Social Democratic Party, for instance, wrote to the SPD provincial committee in Hamburg after Schumacher, just like Adenauer, acting on the orders of the American imperialists and their German junior partners, had rejected every agreement across the zonal frontier. In their open letter the SPD members said:

> "Why are you opposed to Germans from East and West meeting round one table? Why do you always want to reach agreement only with Adenauer and the Americans and never with the Germans in the German Democratic Republic and with the Soviet Union? Why do you oppose the proposal that the occupation powers should withdraw one year after the conclusion of peace treaty?
>
> We warn you that you are driving towards a new catastrophe. We don't want another 1933 . . . we don't want a new war."

Adenauer's and Schumacher's sabotage of the Grotewohl proposal has helped to isolate the Bonn separatist government and its loyal SPD "opposition" from the broad masses of the West German population. The cleft between the people and the Bonn separatist government was further deepened when an offer made by the Volkskammer (Parliament) of the German Democratic Republic to the Bonn parliament was also rejected. The German people could judge who represented the national interests and who betrayed them.

These developments made it clear to further large sections in West Germany too, that the policy of German unity consistently pursued by the government of the German Democratic Republic was the only path to a peaceful development for the whole of Germany.

2. Unity of government and people

The attitude towards peace: a criterion for every German

It is no coincidence that the German Democratic Republic with all sections of the population, with its parties and mass organisations and with its government, stands in the forefront of the responsible and difficult fight of the German people against remilitarisation and war.

In the German Democratic Republic German imperialism and militarism had their foundations destroyed in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement. Every form of warmongering is regarded here as a criminal offence. Here the desire and will for peace of the whole German people has free play to develop, since the government of the German Democratic Republic is a people's government which acts in accordance with the wishes of the people. A criterion with which to judge the real attitude of each individual, each party, each organisation, each government to the vital questions of the German nation is their viewpoint regarding the plebiscite against the remilitarisation of Germany and for a peace treaty in 1951.

On the orders of the American occupation forces and the German monopolists Adenauer and his separatist government replied with bans and ruthless police terror to the appeal of the anti-remilitarisation plebiscite committee set up in West Germany with the cooperation of all circles of the population. In the German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, the appeal found strong approval and ready support from the people and from the government.

In secret conferences on the Petersberg Adenauer and his Ministers conferred with the High Commissioners of the imperialist Western powers how they could stifle the ever growing cry for peace, how they could drive the youth of West Germany into the mass graves of a new world war as quickly as possible. At the same time the President of the German Democratic Republic and the members of the government, together with the officials of the parties and mass organisations, were under way for weeks speaking for peace in factories and workshops, villages and towns and convincing the last possibly hesitant Germans of the necessity of preserving peace and fighting the danger of war. The government and the people were fighting shoulder to shoulder to their utmost for peace.

Appeal for national resistance

In September 1950 the government of the German Democratic Republic appealed to the German people for national resistance to the threat of war. This appeal followed the decision taken at the New York separate conference of the Western powers on September 19th 1950 to considerably strengthen the troops of the imperialist powers in West Germany and to remilitarise West Germany in preparation for American war. The cabinet of the German Democratic Republic passed a resolution on September 21st 1950 which stated in part:

> "The Government of the German Democratic Republic calls on the German people and particularly the population of West Germany to develop national resistance against remilitarisation and aggression . . . in order to secure freedom and unity for the German people. A war would mean the end of our people. We, however, want to live and build for a better future in peace and friendship with all peoples."

3. Resistance in West Germany

Workers and generals

The resistance to the crime of remilitarisation and the preparation of a third world war has, in West Germany, united friends of peace and patriots from all sections of the population and of the most various opinions. This resistance front against remilitarisation and war stretches from ordinary workers to generals of the Second World War who have realised the responsibility which they have for peace and the future of the German people. Behind the active fighters against remilitarisation and war stand the great majority of the population who long for peace and hate war. They watch with growing unrest and bitterness how remilitarisation is being driven ahead against the clear desire of the people. They see how the German imperialists and militarists raise their heads again and become more and more insolent as their influence increases.

Even those West German newspapers which support the anti-German policy of Adenauer and McCloy (either of their own accord or under duress) find it necessary to express sometimes the unrest and bitterness, the true mood of the majority of the German people.

Many of the things they publish confirm the desire for peace of the great majority of the German people. Many of them, particularly the readers' letters, express the various reasons for which ordinary decent people reject the policy of remilitarisation and war and raise their voices for peace.

> "The majority of the German people say plainly: No! . . . Public opinion has not swung in favour of a defence contribution; rather the contrary . . ." ("Stuttgarter Zeitung", June 30th 1951.)

> "It is certain that the overwhelming majority of the German people reject a military contribution."
> ("Mainpost", Würzburg, June 30th 1951.)

"After all I have four children"

On July 17th 1951 the "Norddeutsche Zeitung" published a number of readers' Letters against remilitarisation:

> "The article (an article in favour of remilitarisation ed.) shocked me and gave me the impression that it had been published under pressure. I don't like such a rapid change of opinion and have cancelled my subscription to your paper." (Andreas K., Hanover.)

> "You should know, and you must know, that the overwhelming majority of our people absolutely reject this whole plan for remilitarisation. It seems as though your paper too is trying to launch political propaganda as in the Hitler days." (Robert H., Hanover.)

> "In the federal territory we have more than a million unemployed. Should we not try to give them a decent job instead of simply wanting to hand them a rifle?" (Hans F., Hanover.)

On July 14th/15th 1951 the "Abendpost", Frankfurt/Main, found it necessary to print a number of readers' letters. In this connection the editor remarked that the number of letters against remilitarisation by far exceeded the number in favour.

> "Brother must not be allowed to be deployed against brother on the zonal frontier. When this happens the first shots will not be far away." (H. Sch.)

> "Should they not first answer the question 'why?' Why has not the West produced a rousing cause? Freedom? Where is our freedom from poverty and care? Is it freedom that we are not questioned about this problem vital for the German people?" (A. R., Flensburg.)

> "They negotiate here, they negotiate there, on the Petersberg and in Bonn. But they don't ask us. I know that people will call me a Communist because I want a plebiscite, but I want a chance to say something. After all I have four children." (L. M., Hanover.)

"A revival of German militarism is the death sentence for democracy"

The international magazine "Aufklärung", published in Cologne, which officially describes itself as "supporting American democracy" published an article in No. 2/1951 which stated:

> "Those who today clamour most noisily for a defence contribution in the form of a German army are, unfortunately not the best democrats. They may talk of democracy — but what they really mean is revenge ...
>
> All of us, and the Americans as well as the Russians, have experienced what may happen when an allegedly tame 'Reichswehr' grows up and becomes a Wehrmacht. A revival of German militarism . . . would renew the death sentence on democracy in Germany."

The magazine "Frankfurter Hefte" of June 1951 published the letter of a former Social Democrat who left the party in 1948 because of the hypocritical policy of the right-wing SPD leadership. The letter stated:

> "My father was a Social Democrat. He was good and decent and utterly faithful. So was I. In the First World War I had a basin full as a soldier. Then came the post-war years with starvation, inflation, unemployment (until 1937) and then the frightful twelve years including a term in the Volkssturm (Nazi Home Guard). I don't want a war. Not even against Russia. I am scared for my nice healthy grand-children, seven in all. I am particularly worried about Hansl, age 17, a strapping lad. He is learning to be a bricklayer, and he is already working hard to rebuild what Goebbels, Himmler and Hitler and their megalomaniac clique helped to destroy."

And to close this section here is a quotation from a writer trying to find the way out:

> "Since in the past 50 years we have learnt to know war in its entire ghastliness we should at last try to create a good foundation for a lasting peace." ("Wetzlarer Zeitung", July 11th 1951.)

The development from "Ohne uns" to resistance

The press comments and readers' letters quoted give a slight incomplete view of the anti-war and anti-remilitarisation feeling of the West German population. The fact that a great, an overwhelming, majority of the population oppose remilitarisation and the preparations for American war will be shown below in the section dealing with the plebiscite in West Germany. The first reaction to remilitarisation was the spontaneous, emotional rejection which formed the basis for the "Ohne uns" movement ("Count us out" movement) which encompassed millions of the West German population. Under the influence of the growing danger of war and the frightful destruction and American war horrors in Korea this was supplemented by an increasingly conscious struggle. Large sections of the population of all points of view are today taking part in this conscious fight for peace which is becoming better and better organised. On January 28th 1951 1,700 delegates from all parts of West Germany, together with

a French and a British member of the World Peace Council, took part in a conference against the remilitarisation and rearmament of Germany held in Essen with the slogan "Save peace". This conference agreed on a "Manifesto against German remilitarisation" calling on the Bonn government to carry out a plebiscite. The manifesto stated in part:

> "We, the representatives of millions of men and women from all sections of the German people, workers and peasants, engineers, doctors and scientists, clergymen of both Christian denominations, writers and artists, soldiers, officers and generals of the Second World War, have come together at a time of historic crisis for our homeland in order to consider earnestly and without prejudice how to banish the danger of war. We declare that non-German powers intend to force the German people to participate in the immediate preparations for a third world war. Such a war would start in Germany and would hit our people first of all with its full intensity. Germans would fight against Germans. A third world war would be, at the same time, a German civil war. It would lead to the destruction of our life and the annihilation of our people...
>
> A third world war will be prevented and peace will be saved if the German people make use of their democratic right to decide for themselves on their destiny and the question of war or peace; if the German people express their desire to reject remilitarisation through a plebiscite. Only in this way can a peaceful and happy future for our people be assured."

The Bonn government answered this appeal from the Essen conference with vicious slanders and, when these failed, with a flood of bans and terror measures. However, despite all obstacles the resistance to remilitarisation and the preparations for American war continues unchecked.

The fight of the West German workers

The working people of West Germany and West Berlin have to bear the full brunt of the rise in the cost of living and shrinking real wages which result from remilitarisation and the preparations for war. For this reason the working people combine the fight against poverty, the struggle for higher wages and better conditions of work with the fight against remilitarisation and war. The extent of this struggle, despite the treachery of the right-wing union leaders, can be seen from the fact that at the end of July 1951 the workers had given notice that they were challenging the wage scales in about 100 branches of industry. Great masses of workers are taking part in the wage struggles. West German industrialists have estimated that it would cost about three thousand million marks annually to meet the claim for wage increases. These wage claims are quite reasonable and could obviously be met, since a far greater sum has been spent to prepare the American war in West Germany.

The workers of West Germany are beginning to counter with determination the attacks on their standard of living made by the German and American monopolists. This struggle is at the same time a fight against remilitarisation and war and is supported by all honest patriots in the East and West of Germany.

The miners of the Ruhr proved that they stood in the forefront of the battle against remilitarisation and the danger of war by their successful battle against the so-called "tank shifts", that is to say extra Sunday shifts intended to produce more coal for armaments.

As a result of the miners' struggle production during these "tank shifts" fell so low that the agreement on "tank shifts" concluded between the armaments bosses and the right-wing trade union leaders became null and void.

Hamburg dockworkers set a fine example in the fight against remilitarisation and war preparation. Despite great pressure from the occupation authorities and from the Hamburg dock administration 41 dockers refused for instance in August 1950 to unload explosives and munitions from British ships. When their step resulted in dismissal their mates came out on strike.

At the beginning of July 1951 a conference of the miners and metal workers of West Germany and the German Democratic Republic was held in Halle. More than 500 workers from mines and the metal industry discussed united action against West German remilitarisation and the Schuman plan. The West German Social Democratic miner, Wilhelm Luchs, the main speaker, called on the miners and metal workers of all Germany to act unanimously in resisting remilitarisation.

At the end of July in Eisenach transport workers who had met for an all-German transport workers conference decided to fight together against the remilitarisation of West Germany and the preparation of American war. A resolution adopted unanimously stated:

> "Discuss at your place of work how the transport of war material, coal and scrap for the arms industry can be prevented, and take the necessary measures."

Kurt Hanisch, Secretary of the European Workers' Committee against Remilitarisation appealed to the German seamen and dockworkers to follow the example given by their French and Italian colleagues and go on strike in order to prevent American war material being discharged in German harbours.

The indignation of the West German workers against the steady drop in their standard of living as a result of remilitarisation is on the increase. Their struggle against the attack on their living standard is at the same time a fight against remilitarisation and war. It is becoming stronger, despite the treachery and the sabotage of the right-wing trade union leaders acting on the orders of the American and German monopolists.

Peasants defend their fields

On the orders of the American imperialists Adenauer and Dr. Schumacher have summoned American, British and French reinforcements to Germany. These new troops have not only caused occupation costs to rise by many thousand millions of marks yearly but they have also led to tens of thousands of German peasants being driven from hearth and home. The American, British and French intervention troops demand new manoeuvre grounds, firing ranges, airfields, barracks and luxurious living quarters. The land for the manoeuvre

grounds, airfields and so on is ruthlessly stolen from the peasants. In various villages and country districts the peasants have combined to resist the destruction of their livelihood and to defend their fields and their houses. The American imperialists and their henchmen in Bonn are using the most brutal methods against the peasants. Here is only one example:

> "'For weeks preparations have been made on our land for the construction of a military airfield.' This is the first sentence of an appeal addressed by the Mayor of Sembach in the Pfalz to the public in the name of the whole population of his village. Since the villagers refused to bring in their crops before harvest time the Americans poured petrol over the corn and set fire to it. The appeal of the Mayor of Sembach continues 'the devastation is becoming greater. Bulldozers are chewing up the soil, trees are being blown up, roots and all.' For the second time our fields are being sacrificed to prepare for war. The burning corn will be followed by burning towns and villages if we do not all unitedly take up the cudgels for the defence of our homes.'" (Press report from Kaiserslautern, July 18th 1951.)

In the Mainschleife district near Hammelburg, where a number of villages with a total population of more than 20,000 persons should have been evacuated on American orders to make room for a manoeuvre ground, the peasants and other sections of the population have united and by cooperation have been able so far to prevent their evacuation.

The "Fränkischer Tag" of Bamberg, reported on June 12th:

> "Blank's office in Bonn had been ordered by the American authorities to provide 20 airfields and six manoeuvre grounds. The manoeuvre grounds should be at least 10 miles long and over 5 miles broad. They should all be in the American occupation zone. In the case of Hammelburg it was requested that the manoeuvre ground should be 12 miles long and six miles broad. Making the present Hammelburg camp four times its present size would have entailed the evacuation of seven entire peasant communities in the Hammelburg and Karlstadt district and partial evacuation in 24 other communities in the district of Hammelburg, Karlstadt, Gmünden and Bad Kissingen. About 20,000 persons would have been involved and the entire project would have cost the taxpayers about 87 million marks. The 20,000 persons concerned have declared through their spokesmen that they will not voluntarily leave their homes. Blank's office did not even consult the Bavarian government before taking its decision in this case."

Various districts in all parts of West Germany have reported actions of resistance against the theft of fertile agricultural land for the purpose of preparing American war.

The big scale thefts of land to be used in preparing American war have thus roused the West German peasants and brought them into the resistance movement against remilitarisation and war.

The West German peasants who have already been driven from their farms in tens of thousands as a result of Adenauer's and Schumacher's policy of pre-

paring American war are no longer willing to accept the hypocritical lies of the Bonn government. This government alleges it is powerless against the measures of the imperialist Western powers. The peasants reject also the cynical remark of the American occupation power that it was after all the Bonn government and Schumacher who called in the reinforcements.

The struggle of the peasants against a war for which they are expected to make sacrifices before the first shot is fired is of great importance on an all-German scale. The combination of the bitter resistance by the peasants and the resistance of the workers will multiply the strength of the fight against remilitarisation and American war.

"The Christian task of the day"

The American imperialists and their German henchmen have been particularly worried by a strong trend in the Protestant Church in favour of active resistance to remilitarisation and the preparation of a third world war. This has moved McCloy to the statement, insulting to West German Catholics, that they at least, as against the Protestants, were reliable supporters of the American policy of partition and war.

McCloy's quarterly report for the period January 1st to March 31th 1951 stated:

> "Since the Soviet zone is a predominantly Protestant area it was natural that the feeling for German unity was stronger among Protestant Germans than among the Catholics, who would lose relatively in influence in a united Germany." (p. 23.)

It is absolutely possible that Adenauer, when he sabotages German unity, is also influenced by the line of thought indicated by McCloy. For the bulk of West German Catholics, however, who include in their ranks not a few outstanding German patriots and self-sacrificing fighters for the unity of Germany and for peace, Mr. McCloy's statement is a serious insult.

It is true that the resistance to remilitarisation and the menace of war has been considerably strengthened from Protestant quarters. In October 1950 the resignation of the Bonn Minister of the Interior, Heinemann, caused a real upheaval. Dr. Heinemann explained that he had resigned because he could not reconcile with his conscience as a Christian the unconstitutional policy of remilitarisation and preparation for war which Adenauer was pursuing behind the backs of the German people. Dr. Heinemann who, as President of the General Synod of the Evangelical Church, has great influence in Protestant circles, demanded that the German people be asked for their decision on remilitarisation and war or peace, a decision which only they could make.

Church President Niemöller has also adopted an uncompromising position against remilitarisation and war. Replying to the objection that a plebiscite could not be held because the Bonn Constitution made no provision for such an event, Niemöller declared, in an open letter to Dr. Adenauer:

> "This Constitution has been so cleverly worked out that the German people can be plunged into war again without being asked... The Evangelical Church in Germany has left no doubt that it would support

remilitarisation neither in the East nor in the West. In addition members of the Evangelical Church will take practical steps to oppose remilitarisation and will base themselves on the fact that the Federal Constitution gives them this right. If a constitutional amendment should actually withdraw this right then we shall once again have to base ourselves on the fact that we should obey God rather than men."

Representatives of the Brotherhood of the Confessional Church have adopted a similar position.

A letter from Professor Karl Barth, the Swiss theologian, in which he described the struggle against the remilitarisation of West Germany and the fight for peace as the Christian task of the day, has had great influence on Protestant clergy.

German Protestants have been greatly encouraged to take part in the fight against remilitarisation and the danger of war by the position adopted by such influential leaders of the Protestant Church. However, the attitude in the Protestant Church is not completely unanimous. There are a few high church dignitaries who identify themselves with American war policy.

For neutrality — against remilitarisation

Apart from certain sections of the Protestant Church for whom Niemöller is the spokesman, a number of bourgeois organisations oppose the remilitarisation of West Germany and the preparation of American war by demanding strict neutrality for Germany in the dispute between the great powers. These exponents of neutrality include a "Neutral Germany" association in Hamburg, the "Association of Conscientious Objectors", the "International Fellowship of Reconciliation", and the so-called "Nauheimer Kreis".

The supporters of neutrality are also persecuted by Adenauer, Lehr and their police and their names go down on various black lists as "suspected Communists". A considerable number of the supporters of pro-neutrality organisations take an active part in the fight against the remilitarisation of West Germany and the preparation of a third world war.

Youth in the forefront

The youth of West Germany whom McCloy and Adenauer want to use as cannon fodder for the American war are in the forefront of the fight against remilitarisation and the danger of war. Not only the Free German Youth, unconstitutionally banned by the Adenauer government because of their work for peace, but also the members of many other youth organisations take part in the active struggle. The youth organisation of the "Zentrum" Party, called the "Windthorst-Bund" at its annual conference in March 1951 passed a resolution opposing remilitarisation and asking the Deputy Foreign Ministers in Paris to agree on the reestablishment of German unity. ("Volksstimme", Cologne, March 13th 1951)

Some 400 delegates of the Social Democratic youth organisation "Falken", also rejected outright the remilitarisation of Germany at a conference in Heidelberg in March 1951. ("Fuldaer Volkszeitung", Fulda, March 27th 1951)

Members of various youth organisations cooperated in the Heligoland action of German youth which roused and mobilised large sections of German public opinion. As a protest against the misuse of the island as bombing target for the British Airforce, the first youth delegation landed on Heligoland in March 1951. They were removed from the island by force and the young German patriots were sentenced to terms of imprisonment. They were followed by a second, a third and a fourth Heligoland delegation until finally the former inhabitants of the island also landed there and protested against the destruction caused by the British bombardment.

36 young Germans of both sexes made up the fourth Heligoland delegation of German youth. The British Military Government High Court and its Chief Justice O'Hanlon and Justice Lovell, together with the Chief Prosecutor Ticehurst covered themselves with disgrace by sentencing the young German patriots and friends of peace to terms of imprisonment and to "Approved Schools".

The fight of German youth against the bombardment of Heligoland led to the success that the British Military Government found itself forced to declare that it wanted to find another target for its bombing.

The fury of the imperialist Western powers and the Reuter administration is directed against the youth of West Berlin who despite the worst terror increase their fight for peace. Only because of their work for peace many boys and girls, often younger than 16, have been imprisoned in West Berlin. 30 of them sent a message of greeting from the remand prison in Moabit (British sector) to the millions taking part in the 3rd World Festival of Youth and Students in Berlin in August 1951.

Youth act against demolitions

West German youth are in the vanguard of the resistance to the demolition and destruction planned as preparation for the American war. At the beginning of July 1951, for instance, young German patriots closed with cement the demolition chambers which had been constructed on American orders on both sides of the road along the Rhine heneath the Loreley crag. Two cubic yards of cement were poured into each of a total of twelve of the demolition chambers, which were over 18 ft deep. Inhabitants of the district as well as lorry drivers and motorists passing helped in the work.

The demolition chambers constructed on American orders in the railway bridge near Eyb in the Ansbach district were also rendered useless.

Citizens of Kitzingen threw into the river Main the machines being used by the firm of Arthur Rust to bore demolition chambers in the bridge over the river, and the work had to be suspended. A heavy compressed air machine was among the equipment thrown into the river.

These examples were followed at many other places and in a number of cases town councils refused to hand over plans of bridges to the American interventionists who wanted to use them for constructing the demolition chambers.

These deeds of active resistance were the signal for a new phase in the West German people's struggle against remilitarisation and the preparation of a new war by the American and German imperialists.

Courts oppose Adenauer

It should be noted that Adenauer's and McCloy's apparatus of terror in West Germany does not always prove reliable. There are judges who are not willing to support Adenauer's police in their breaches of the constitution and of basic rights. Here are a number of examples:

In July 1951 the court in Solingen refused to sentence Sbosny and Müller, two friends of peace, who had been charged with supporting the plebiscite. The judges ruled: "According to paragraph V of the Bonn Basic Law no German can be forbidden to seek information on all subjects, in this case public opinion on remilitarisation . . . This is also the case when such a poll is not of an official character. The police order issued by the Ministry of the Interior (banning the plebiscite, ed.) must be regarded as illegal. The accused are acquitted and granted costs."

In the middle of June a Karlsruhe court annulled the ban on a peace demonstration in Mannheim, basing its decision on paragraph VIII of the Basic Law which guarantees the freedom of assembly.

One June 14th 1951 a Lemgo court acquitted Fred Siegmann, a student, and Ernst Wibsiek, a worker who had taken part in the plebiscite. The judge emphasised that the plebisicite was not a breach of the rights guaranteed by the Basic Law.

From both West Germany and West Berlin cases have been reported in which members of the police have refused to take action against fighters for peace or against the anti-remilitarisation plebiscite.

Clear answer to the policy of war

Although the great majority of the people of West Germany reject remilitarisation and the American policy of war, the Deputies of the Bonn separatist parliament, with very few exceptions, cooperate with the American and German imperialists who want to start a new world war.

Apart from the Deputies of the Communist Party of Germany who use every possibility to fight against remilitarisation, even in the separatist parliament of Bonn, Frau Wessel, Deputy of the Zentrum Party, has been one of those who has opposed the remilitarisation of West Germany. The Deputies of the CDU, the SPD and so on, on the other hand, act as underlings of the American and German monopolists in their policy of war.

The Communist Deputy, Max Reimann, gave a clear answer to the war policy of Adenauer's government in the 24th session of the Bonn separatist parliament. He said:

> "Five years have not yet passed since the unconditional surrender of Hitler fascism; the tears of the children and the mothers who lost their fathers and their sons in this fascist predatory war are not yet dried; no peace treaty has yet been concluded. Occupation troops are still stationed in Germany. Our homeland is partitioned. The homes still lie in ruins. Despite all this a German politician wants to force German youth back into uniform. In the Second World War Hitler and his fascist generals uselessly

sacrificed the German people's most valued possession, the youth, in criminal plans for world domination on the orders of the German monopolists.

I ask you, Herr Adenauer, in whose interest and on whose orders are you demanding the inclusion of German troop contingents in a foreign army which you describe as 'European'? . . .

In the last few days I have had a chance to talk to workers of all opinions and of all political views. I have talked to members of the middle class and to others. They have asked me the question: Since parliament is elected for four years must we tolerate an Adenauer government for four years? I found general agreement when I explained that the German people had voted as they did on August 14th because Dr. Adenauer and Dr. Blücher had wisely refrained from telling the people, before the election, of the measures contrary to the interests of the people which they have already carried out or which they intend.

I explained too that the German people had once before given a chancellor four years time and that this had led to the catastrophe of a war; the people must learn from this never again to give four years time to a chancellor whose policy conjures up the danger of war." (Official minutes, Bonn, Bundestag, 24th session 1950, p. 737 et. seq.)

4. Plebiscite throughout Germany

Illegal ban on plebiscite in West Germany

On April 24th 1951 the Bonn separatist government decided to ban the plebiscite against the remilitarisation of Germany and for a peace treaty in 1951. They took this step because they were frightened by the growth of the resistance to the preparation of an American war, and the support given by the mass of the West German people to the plebiscite which had been decided on by the Essen conference against remilitarisation and rearmament on January 28th 1951. This ban represented a crass breach of the constitution of the Bonn separatist state. The main plebiscite committee made up of German patriots from all sections of the population and of the most divergent opinions, made a solemn protest against the ban. A Manifesto which the committee issued on May 4th 1951 stated that the plebiscite would be carried out regardless of the ban, which was illegal:

"The appeal to prepare the plebiscite against remilitarisation and for a peace treaty with Germany in 1951 has met with support from the widest sections of the population.

On January 28th 1951, for instance, 1,700 delegates met in Essen and on April 14th 1951 the main plebiscite committee was created including representatives of all sections of the population. The decisions taken by this committee have received the enthusiastic support of all who love their homeland and peace. In Frankfurt/Main a conference of more than 1,000 members and officials of the Social Democratic Party,. speaking in the name of all Social Democrats in West Germany identified themselves with

the call for a plebiscite. 400 workers from West German factories took part in the European Workers' Conference. At the Peasants' Conference held on April 22nd in Kassel 730 peasants and agronomists, speaking in the name of all peasants, stated: 'We want to sow and reap in peace.' Leading German intellectuals meeting at the Cultural Congress in Assmannshausen declared themselves in favour of the plebiscite in order to preserve German culture. In only three days more than 61,000 signatures were obtained in Rheinland-Pfalz against remilitarisation and for the conclusion of a peace treaty.

In opposition to the vital interests of our people foreign and German arms kings and other warmongers have unleashed a campaign of hatred against the plebiscite. Adenauer, terrified of public opinion, has broken the Basic Law and banned the plebiscite. *We solemnly declare that such a decision of the Federal Government is invalid and not binding upon us. It is based on an obvious breach of law, on the negation of the most elementary democratic rights of the citizens of the Federal Republic to express their opinion freely . . .*

On our side are the overwhelming majority of all Germans;

the workers who desire peaceful construction and not new destruction of their places of work;

the peasants who can harvest only in peace;

the shopkeepers and business-men who can trade freely only in peace;

the scientists, the artists, and the teachers who can only develop their work in peace.

On our side are members of both Churches who are bound by their Christian duty to pray and work daily for the maintenance of peace.

On our side are German youth who want a life in peace and freedom, not mutilation and a mass grave.

On our side are the German mothers and the German girls who cannot forget the horrors of the air-raids and who know that remilitarisation and war will wreck all their hopes of family happiness.

On our side are the decent former soldiers and officers who have realised the futility of a new war.

On our side are justice and law.

These reasons move us to the solemn declaration: The plebiscite will take place. No breach of law and constitution can stop it . . .

Those who do not take part in the plebiscite will share the responsibility for all the results of remilitarisation.

The plebiscite is the decision on life and death."

Twenty different plebiscite polls—one result

The plebiscite against the remilitarisation of Germany and for the conclusion of a peace treaty in 1951 is being carried out in all parts of West Germany despite the ban and police terror. The result is that 70%, 80%, in the majority of cases

even 90% of those asked oppose the remilitarisation of Germany and are in favour of a peace treaty in 1951. A number of people, frightened by the ban and measures of terror, abstain from voting, but only a minute proportion are in favour of German remilitarisation.

The Amerian imperialists and their German stooges use the fact that the plebiscite cannot be carried out publicly everywhere, because of the illegal bans and persecutions, to throw doubt on the results. These doubts can easily be dispelled.

From the end of 1948 until today newspapers and magazines of all political opinions as well as various public opinion institutes have investigated the attitude of the West German population to German remilitarisation. The results of ten of these private polls will be compared with ten plebiscite results from West Germany selected at random from those carried out in the past few months by plebiscite committees.

Private polls show overwhelming majority against remilitarisation

(1) In November 1949 the "Bremer Nachrichten" organised a poll on German rearmament. 72% of the answers flatly rejected German rearmament.

(2) The Emnid Institute, Bielefeld, which conducts so-called "public opinion analyses" put the question in January 1950: "Would you think it right to become a soldier again or that your son or your husband should become a soldier again?" 74.6% of the answers were in the negative.

(3) The magazine "Mann in der Zeit", Fulda, the organ of the German Roman Catholic bishops, raised the question of military service in January 1950. 90.7% of the replies received rejected all forms of military service.

(4) The Education Department of the American Provincial Commissioner for Bavaria in May 1950 asked 560 students at the Universities of Munich and Erlangen, 70% of them former soldiers, the question: "If Germany had a Wehrmacht again would you want to be a soldier?" In Erlangen 91% and in Munich 96% of the students answered with "No".

(5) In August 1950 the newspaper "Reutlinger Generalanzeiger" asked readers: "Do you want a Wehrmacht again?" 91.3% of all those taking part answered in the negative.

(6) The illustrated weekly "7 Tage", (Constance), got 16,000 answers when it asked in September 1950: "Do you want German rearmament?" and "Are you ready yourself to do military service?" 73% of the replies said "No" to the first question and 85% said "No" to the second.

(7) In October 1950 the magazine "Befreiung", (Essen), the organ of the Catholic working youth organisation, raised the question of rearmament and conscientious objection. 71% of those asked decisively rejected the thought of rearmament.

(8) In the same period the "Frankenpost", (Hof), asked its readers for their opinion. 89% of those replying rejected rearmament out of hand.

(9) "Die Welt", Hamburg reported on December 3rd 1950 a poll of students at Göttingen University. 69% of the students opposed the remilitarisation of West Germany.

(10) "Die Tat" of Frankfurt/Main, held a poll on November 25th 1950 under the general title: "Should we have a round table conference or should we knock each other on the head?." Four questions were set:

(a) Should the governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union jointly declare that they reject the remilitarisation of Germany and support the creation of a united, peace-loving, democratic German state as decided at Potsdam? Yes or No.

(b) Are you in favour of the lifting of all restrictions on German peace economy? Yes or No.

(c) Are you in favour of an immediate conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and for the withdrawal of occupation troops within a year of the conclusion of the peace treaty? Yes or No.

(d) Would you welcome it if representatives of East and West Germany met together in the form of a "all-German Constituent Council" in order to prepare the formation of a united and peace-loving Germany and to make proposals for the conclusion of a peace treaty? Yes or No.

On January 6th 1951 "Die Tat" published the result of 4756 answers. 4702 of these answered all questions with "Yes", 28 entries were invalid and 26 entries answered one or another of the questions with "No". 30% of the replies came from women who answered all questions with "Yes".

Remilitarisation is rejected in Munich just as in Berlin

(1) A 21 men comittee carried out a plebiscite in the "Waggonfabrik Uerdingen AG", in Uerdingen, in April 1951. They put the question: "Are you opposed to the remilitarisation of Germany and in favour of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951?" From a total of 817 workers in the factory 627 that is to say 76.6% answered with "Yes". The votes were publicly counted.

(2) 400 plebiscite helpers held a big plebiscite in Hanau on June 24th 1951. 18,000 inhabitants of the town were asked to vote. 87 % voted against the remilitarisation of Germany.

(3) In June 1951 a plebiscite was carried out among students of the University of Erlangen in the course of the "Forum Politicum". 88.6% voted against the remilitarisation of Germany.

(4) In July 1951 80 voluntary helpers carried out a plebiscite in front of the gates of the "Badischen Anilin & Sodawerke" in Ludwigshafen. Despite police terror 3607 workers voted, 93.43% of them against German remilitarisation.

(5) In Munich up to the end of June 1951 36,115 persons had been polled. 33,373 voted against remilitarisation, 1,755 abstained from voting and only 987 voted for remilitarisation.

(6) In Württemberg-Baden on July 9th and 10th 13,272 persons were polled, 94,6% of them voted against the remilitarisation of Germany and only 262 in favour. 430 people abstained from voting.

(7) Up to the beginning of July 29,168 inhabitants of Fürth, 54% of the total electorate of 54,000, had taken part in the plebiscite. 26,595 of them voted against the remilitarisation of Germany.

(8) 400 miners working on day shift and 300 on early morning shift in the "Hugo Ost" pit in Gelsenkirchen voted against remilitarisation. Not a single miner gave his vote in favour of remilitarisation and not a single man abstained from voting.

(9) From 662 people living in the Bochumer Strasse in Wanne-Eickel, 638 voted against the remilitarisation of Germany.

(10) Up to July 11th 1951 219,433 citizens of West Berlin were asked their opinion on German remilitarisation. 87.1% voted against the remilitarisation of Germany and in favour of a peace treaty in 1951. Factory plebiscites showed a total of 90.9% against remilitarisation.

Plebiscites in the West German factories have shown nearly always at least 90% against the remilitarisation of Germany and in favour of a peace treaty in 1951. Here are a few examples from Juli 1951:

Saar pits: Those asked 2570, against remilitarisation 2456, abstentions 99, for remilitarisation 15.

Frankfurt Railway repair shop: Those asked 428, against remilitarisation 392, abstentions 31, for remilitarisation 5.

Pits Fürst Leopold and Baldur: Those asked 2174, against remilitarisation 2129, abstentions 45, for remilitarisation nil.

Hüls Chemical works: those asked 4020, against remilitarisation 3770, abstentions 217, for remilitarisation 33.

Howald shipyards, Kiel: those asked 1673, against remilitarisation 1594, abstentions 51, for remilitarisation 28.

Wieland-Werk, Vöhring/Upper Bavaria: those asked 1354, against remilitarisation 1266, abstentions 80, for remilitarisation 8.

Similar results were obtained in many other West German factories. In conclusion here are the results of a particularly interesting plebiscite action carried out in July 1951 among the spectators at motorcycle races near Ingolstadt. A total of 9837 spectators were asked for their opinion. 9538 voted against remilitarisation, nobody abstained and 288 voted for remilitarisation. The remaining polling papers could not be counted since they were seized by the police.

It will be seen that whether in a private poll or in the plebiscite the result was always 70, 80, 90% or more of all Germans who were opposed to any remilitarisation of Germany.

The reestablishment of German militarism by the American and German imperialists is thus taking place against the express wishes of the overwhelming majority of the German people. The American imperialists and warmongers and their German junior partners control only a handful of bought German puppets in West Germany. The German people reject them and their policy of war.

Plebiscite in the German Democratic Republic

On April 25th 1951 the main plebiscite committee formed in West Germany addressed the following application to the government of the German Democratic Republic:

"Düsseldorf, April 25th 1951

Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl,
Chancellery,
Government of the German Democratic Republic,
Berlin W 8

Sir,

On January 28th this year 1,700 delegates of the Essen 'Conference against Remilitarisation and Rearmament of Germany' decided to apply to Federal Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer, to carry out a plebiscite against the remilitarisation of Germany and for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951. Since Adenauer's government did not comply with this request the Main Plebiscite Committee constituted on April 14th in Essen addressed itself directly to the population of the Federal Republic, calling upon them to vote on the question:

'Are you opposed to the remilitarisation of Germany and in favour of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951?'

In the meantime on April 24th Adenauer's government, acting against law and justice, banned the plebiscite.

The Main Committee has received proposals and suggestions from all sections of the population that it should not confine its initiative to West Germany and should not carry out the plebiscite in the Federal Republic alone, but should take steps to ensure that the citizens of the German Democratic Republic should also have an opportunity to express their opinion, in a free and unfettered plebiscite, on this question vital to the fate of Germany and our entire German people. In accordance with these proposals we are turning to you, Sir, with the request that you submit our suggestion to the government and the Volkskammer of the German Democratic Republic in order that a plebiscite on German remilitarisation and the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in 1951 may be held in the territory of the German Democratic Republic.

We are, Sir, etc.
For the Main Plebiscite Commitee
E. Hoerath-Menge Karl Hentschel
Hellmuth von Mücke Johannes Oberhof"

On May 4th 1951 the government decided to support this proposal and on May 9th the Volkskammer unanimously approved the government proposal to hold the plebiscite from June 3rd to 5th 1951. The Deputy Prime Minister, Walter Ulbricht, speaking to the government motion in the Volkskammer, stated:

"We are in favour of the plebiscite in the German Democratic Republic because we are opposed to remilitarisation in the whole of Germany. We are in favour of the plebiscite in the German Democratic Republic

to express the fact that the peace-loving population of the German Democratic Republic feels itself inseparably united by brotherly bonds with the forces of peace in West Germany and in Berlin, the capital of Germany...

The plebiscite has become a vital question for our entire people because in West Germany the Adenauer clique has made agreements with General Eisenhower and McCloy, contrary to the wishes of the German people, agreements directed against peace and against the existence of the German nation. Truman and Eisenhower have taken over Hitler's race hatred and idiotic plans of world domination and Adenauer has taken over the policy of revenge of Hugenberg, Papen and Hitler. That is the way to a third world war. The plebiscite has become the most urgent task of the entire people.

...There are people in West Germany who say that a plebiscite for a peace treaty with Germany is quite a good idea, but that the Soviet Union is certainly behind it all. Regarded from a sensible point of view the forces for peace in Germany would be happy if as many states as possible were behind the German people's demand for the conclusion of a peace treaty. For example everybody would be pleased if Britain and the United States too supported the conclusion of a peace treaty by the great powers with Germany. The only real measure of the relationship of peace-loving Germans to the various great powers must be based on the attitude of each of the great powers towards a peace treaty with Germany and the resultant withdrawal of occupation troops. In any case the Soviet Union has proved that she has followed a consistent policy in this question...

Whatever objections some of our citizens may have to the construction of Communism in the Soviet Union, nobody can deny something which every peace-loving citizen must highly appreciate. That is the consistent support given by the representatives of the Soviet Union, at all international conferences, to a peaceful solution of the problem of German unity and for the creation of a united, peace-loving and democratic German state. At the Preliminary Conference of the Deputy Foreign Ministers in Paris, Gromyko, the representative of the USSR, has again demanded 'the speeding up of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the resultant withdrawal of the occupation troops from Germany'. A firm guiding line for this policy of peace are Generalissimo Stalin's words in the historic telegram which he sent to President Wilhelm Pieck and Prime Minister Otto Grotewohl on the occasion of the formation of the German Democratic Republic:

'There can be no doubt that the existence of a peace-loving democratic Germany side by side with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union bars the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslavement of the European countries by the world imperialists.'

The Soviet Union is the only European state which since its foundation has never done anything contrary to the national interests of the German people . . .

> Friendship with the Soviet Union must become the cause of all patriotic Germans."

Deputy Prime Minister Walter Ulbricht closed his speech with these rousing words:

> "This is the hour of responsibility for the German people.
>
> Every German who desires with all his heart that no mother shall ever again mourn her son must vote with 'Yes'.
>
> The German people must defend peace to the utmost."

On May 15th 1951 the President of the German Democratic Republic, Wilhelm Pieck, broadcasting to the German people, stated:

> ". . . We must preserve our homeland from the frightful crime committed by the American warmongers in Korea where they have turned the whole country into scorched earth. All political and religious differences of opinion must take second place in the face of this great national task of preventing war and saving our homeland. Every single person should realise that his own life, that the life of his wife and child, that our homes, that the future of the German nation, are at stake. In the fullness of this conviction everyone must put his entire strength at the service of making the plebiscite a unanimous and mighty demonstration of the desire for a free and peaceful future in an united German homeland."

The results of the plebiscite in the German Democratic Republic and in the Democratic Sector of Berlin show to what degree the Volkskammer, the President and the members of the government, the parties and the mass organisations are in accord with the longing for peace and the will for peace of all sections of the German people. The German people have shown that they were worthy of their great responsibilities.

From a total electorate of 12,750,799 in the German Democratic Republic 12,690,914 took part in the plebiscite. 12,153,352 (95.93% of all those giving valid votes) voted against remilitarisation and for a peace treaty. In the democratic sector of Berlin the result of the plebiscite was similar.

This plebiscite proves that where the German people are free to raise their voices they reject remilitarisation and war by an overwhelming majority.

In West Germany and West Berlin the American imperialists and Adenauer's separatist government have banned the plebiscite and they persecute the friends of peace, because they know that a free vote in West Germany and West Berlin would show the same overwhelming result as in the German Democratic Republic.

5. A severe blow

The rejection of German remilitarisation by the great majority of the population and in particular the organised resistance, extending to specific actions, to remilitarisation and the preparation for a planned American war have thrown the American warmongers into considerable confusion. Adenauer and his military advisers have, it is true, promised McCloy and Eisenhower that they will

overcome the resistance of the German people. The people will lose all their ideas of independence once they have been buttoned-up in the straitjacket of time-honoured Prussian drill, Adenauer promised. These promises have, however, not been able to remove the doubts and the confusion among the warmongers.

On September 6th 1950 the "Neue Züricher Zeitung", which supports American policy 150%, found itself forced to say:

> "The population of West Germany has shown an attitude of reserve, if not of opposition, to rearmament. In foreign countries, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon countries this attitude has given rise to considerable astonishment . . ."

On February 17th 1951 the British weekly "New Statesman and Nation" had to admit that the opposition to rearmament in Germany was particularly strong.

> "It is beginning to spread across the whole spectrum of German life, drawing in people of the most diverse parties and politics. 400 lawyers, doctors, teachers, businessmen and others... declared that 'the German people does not want Germany to be a battlefield. It will not sacrifice one man or one pfennig for war!' These people are not led by Communists . . . In spite of all smears and boycotts by the press and government the influence of these groups with their demand for peaceful reunification is undoubtedly growing."

In his quarterly report to United States Secretary of State Acheson for the period from October 1st to December 31st 1950, McCloy admitted that the rejection of remilitarisation and American war policy had gripped large sections of the West German population. He added that it was believed that the German people would change their attitude with the progressive realisation of the North Atlantic Pact states' decision to increase their military power.

The American "Harper's Magazine" expressed McCloy's hope somewhat more brutally in a leading article on West German rearmament which stated cynically:

> "If Eisenhower's army really gets somewhat stronger... the Germans too will not continue to be so reserved. Just like God, the Germans are generally to be found on the side of the big battalions." (Quoted from "Deutsche Zeitung und Wirtschaftszeitung", Stuttgart, June 6th 1951.)

These cynical remarks by American merchants in German cannon fodder show a striking relationship with Adenauer's "demands" for a reinforcement of the American troops of intervention in West Germany and Dr. Schumacher's oft-repeated request that the American imperialists should train their troops on the Lüneburger heath or the Rhine instead of in Arizona or Texas. The treacherous game is clear for all to see.

American High Commissioner McCloy's official quarterly report for the period January 1st to March 31st 1951 breathed a spirit of annoyance and confusion about the steadily growing and ever more effective resistance of the German people which threatened to checkmate American plans. Despite all attempts at camouflage McCloy is forced to admit the presence of strong and determined resistance. His desperate attempts to represent the fight of the German people for German unity and against the American war as the result of an apparently all-powerful "Communist propaganda" only recoil on his own head and that of

his puppets. He can propose no remedy except the further reinforcement of American intervention troops in Germany, who should cow the population of West Germany and tame them for the ends of American imperialism and its German appendage.

The bitter reaction of the American and German imperialists, the German people's greatest enemies, show that the resistance of the people has hit the forces of war where it hurts them most.

6. The German people are not alone

The German people are not alone in their fight against the remilitarisation of West Germany and the preparation for an American war, this fight which is inseparably bound up with the struggle for a united, democratic and peace-loving Germany. They have the support of all peace-loving peoples in the world and the forces for peace in all nations. They have the support of the mighty camp of peace led by the Soviet Union. The states united in this camp have a total population of more than 800 million. Their fight for the preservation of peace finds the sympathy and support of the great majority of all mankind. The fight of the German people against remilitarisation and the preparation of an American war, whether the individuals engaged are aware of it or not, is part of the great world-wide fight for peace and against the criminal plans of the warmongers.

The West German peasants from the Mainschleife who defend their fields against destruction by American or British tanks; the miners in the Ruhr who defend themselves by striking against the drop in the standard of living caused by the remilitarisation of West Germany; the mothers who want to save their sons from ending in the mass graves of the American war; the voluntary helpers in the plebiscite against the remilitarisation of Germany and for the conclusion of a peace treaty in 1951 — all of them are not only defending their own interests, their lives, their livelihoods and the existence of the German nation. By defending their interests in the right way, by devoting their entire strength to the defence of their lives, their livelihoods, the existence of the German nation and peace, they are at the same time defending the life and the livelihood of peace-loving people in France, the Soviet Union, in Britain, in Poland, or in the United States of America. Just as peace itself is indivisible, so is the fight for peace indivisible. The French and Italian dockers who refuse to unload American weapons and munitions; the Paris housewives and London dockers who protest against the great rise in prices caused by rearmament; the Soviet workers who perform heroic deeds of labour every day on the great construction projects of Communism; the British clergymen who work untiringly for peace — all of them, by defending their own interests in the right way, by devoting all their strength to the struggle for their lives and livelihoods, the existence of their peoples and the preservation of peace, fight too for the life and livelihood of the German peasants, the Ruhr miners, the German mothers and the plebiscite helpers.

The knowledge of this relationship, the knowledge that all peace-loving people of the world are allies, this knowledge multiplies the strength and endurance of each single person, giving him courage and the certainty of the final victory of his just cause, even when here or there the enemies of peace appear

to have won temporary successes. The population of West Germany are exposed daily to a lying propaganda of hate on the Goebbels' pattern and encounter brutal measures of terror if they dare to work for peace. For them the knowledge that they are linked with the peace-loving people of the entire world and that they can rely on the unconquerable camp of peace is of the utmost importance.

The remilitarisation of Germany, which would mean war and would make the survival of the German people questionable, affects all peoples, not only the German people. That could be seen particularly clearly at the European Workers' Conference against German Remilitarisation, proposed by the workers of the Hagen-Haspe Foundry in the Ruhr, which met from March 23rd to 25th in 1951 in Berlin, attended by some 900 delegates from 17 European countries. The decisions of this conference were marked by the readiness of the workers of the European countries to take over the leading role in the fight for the preservation of peace, against the remilitarisation of West Germany and the preparation of American war. They represented a great help and support in the German people's fight for peace.

The active assistance given by the governments of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies has been of decisive importance in the fight of the German people for the creation of a united, peace-loving, democratic and independent Germany, for a just peace treaty and for the maintenance and safeguarding of peace. The Soviet Union is the only one of the signatories to the Potsdam Agreement who has fulfilled her obligations in her occupation zone to lay the foundations of a peaceful and democratic Germany. At all conferences of the great powers at which the German question was discussed, the Soviet Union has raised the question of German unity, demilitarisation and the guarantee for a peaceful development of the German people. The Soviet Union played a leading part in the Eight Power Discussions in Prague which decided on specific proposals for a peaceful solution of the German question and to guarantee peace in Europe.

These Prague decisions, in the drafting of which the German Democratic Republic participated, stated in part:

> "In the interest of maintaining peace and security in Europe and taking into consideration the just demands of the German people for a speedy realisation of a peaceful solution for Germany, the governments of the USSR, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Hungary and the German Democratic Republic find the following to be urgently necessary:
>
> (1) The publication of a declaration by the governments of the USA, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union that they will not allow the remilitarisation of Germany and her inclusion in any plans of aggression and that they will consistently carry out the Potsdam decisions to guarantee the conditions for the creation of a united, peace-loving, democratic German state.
>
> (2) The removal of all restrictions on the development of German peace industry and the prevention of the reestablishment of German war potential.

(3) The conclusion without delay of a peace treaty with Germany which would restore the unity of the German state in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement, and including the condition that the occupation troops of all powers be withdrawn from Germany within a year of the conclusion of the peace treaty."

A further fourth point called for the formation of an all-German Constituent Council.

These Prague decisions represented and continue to represent a most valuable support for the struggle of the German people for peace and their vital interests. These decisions show the whole world that in their just fight the German people can rely on the active support of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

Peace can be maintained

In Stalin's interview with a correspondent of "Pravda" in February 1951, Stalin gave the following answer to the question: "Do you believe a new world war to be inevitable?":

> "No. For the present, at least, one must not regard it as inevitable. Naturally, there are, in the United States of America, in Britain and also in France aggressive forces hankering after a new war. They need war to make surplus profits and to plunder other countries. They are the multi-millionaires and millionaires who regard war as a source of income which brings them colossal profits.
>
> These aggressive forces hold the reactionary governments in their hands and direct them. At the same time, however, they fear their peoples who want no new war and who are in favour of the preservation of peace. That is why they endeavour to use the reactionary governments to enmesh their peoples in a web of lies, to defraud them and to represent a new war as a war of defence while describing the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as an aggressive policy. They attempt to mislead their peoples in order to force their aggressive plans upon them and drag them into a new war.
>
> For this reason they fear the campaign for the defence of peace in their apprehension that this campaign could expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.
>
> For this reason they thwart the proposals of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a pact of peace, for the limitation of armaments and for the banning of atomic weapons, since they fear that the acceptance of these proposals would foil the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and make the arms race superfluous.
>
> How will this struggle between the aggressive and the peace-loving forces end?
>
> Peace will be preserved and made more secure if the people take into their own hands the preservation of peace and defend it to the utmost. War can become inevitable if the instigators of war are succesful in enmeshing the masses of the people in a web of lies, defrauding them and dragging them into a new war.
>
> That is why the broad campaign for the preservation of peace is of first-class importance as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the instigators of war.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned she will continue to carry out, unwaveringly, the policy of preventing war and preserving peace."

As this White Book has shown, West Germany has become a first class danger to peace as a result of the policy of the imperialist Western powers led by the United States who rely on German imperialism as an ally. The German and foreign warmongers expect the German people to provide the cannon fodder. West German economy is being converted into a forward arms base. West Germany is being prepared to serve as a deployment ground and theatre of war. The foundation for this policy of war preparation in West Germany was laid by the Western powers through their planned partitioning of Germany.

The aggressive American and German imperialists are trying to mislead the population of West Germany and to represent their American war of aggression on the one hand as a war of defence and on the other hand to represent the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic as an aggressive policy. In this way they want to make the German people ready for American war. The preparations for American war on German territory are already far advanced. War production is speeding up. A West German Wehrmacht led by the old aggressive forces of German imperialism is in the making. The cadres of officers and non-commissioned officers for the formation of a mass army which, armed with American weapons and under American command, should attack the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies and the German Democratic Republic, are already present to a large extent in the various police formations and in the "Labour Units" controlled by the imperialist Western powers. The reestablishment of German militarism would be completed by the introduction of conscription. The menace to peace has therefore reached a new and more acute stage. The threat of war, the threat from German imperialism, affects all the peoples of Europe, the French people like the German people, the peoples of the Soviet Union like the peoples of Great Britain, Belgium and Italy.

The results hitherto achieved in the fight of the German people against remilitarisation and the danger of war have shown that the warmongers cannot carry out their plans if the German people, who in their overwhelming majority love and need peace, just like all other peoples, devote their strength to the preservation of peace, to the prevention of the completion of remilitarisation in West Germany, and for the establishment of a united, peace-loving and democratic Germany.

The German people have a great responsibility for peace. It will depend on them whether the imperialists, lusting for war, are able to carry out their plans or whether peace will be saved. If the German people do not allow the warmongers to delude them then the American war in Europe will not take place. If the population of West Germany waver in their resistance then the war which would destroy the existence of the German nation can become inevitable.

The fight against war, is at the same time, a fight to ensure the existence of the German nation, the life and the existence of each individual. What matters now is that every German recognises the greatness of the danger, the greatness of his responsibility and acts accordingly.

List of names

Abs, Hermann J. 66 67 71
Acheson 34 190
Adam Opel AG 60
Adenauer, Konrad 21 39 49 50 58 60 67 68 88 91 92 93 94 95 96 102 103 108 126 130 143 147 148 150 155 156 159 170 171 172 173 176 178 179 181 182 187 188 189
AEG 60 72
Afflerbach 78
Agartz, Victor 67 82
Allen, Henry T. 23
Allen, James S. 29
Aluminiumfactory Lünen 78
AKU-Trust 76
Altstetter, Josef 142
Ammon, Wilhelm v. 142
Anorgana s. IG Farben
Arndt, Dr. 103
Attlee 17 113 114 115

Badische Anilin- and Sodawerke Ludwigshafen 185
Barth, Prof. Karl 179
Baumbach 150
Bayer, Hans 142
Beck-Broichsitter 152
Bérad, A. 153
Bernstein, Colonel 43 44 62
Bevin, Ernest 46
Bishop, General 127
Blackett 14
Blank, Theodor 147 148 153
Blücher, Franz 69 182
Bobermin, Hans 142
Bohle 142
Bradley, Omar 122
Bremer Wollkämmerei 78
Brookmann 90 92
Brückner, Heinz 142
Brüning 67
Bruns, Gerhard 72
Bülow, Friedrich v. 142
Federal Association of Industry 67
Burchett, W. G. 29 30 31 33 35 37
Busche, Axel v. 147
Buttenwieser, B. P. 153

Cannon 119
Carnegie 73
Chamberlain 25
Chase National Bank 59
Churchill, Winston 16 23 44 112
Clark, Delbert 31
Clay, Lucius 31 32 36 37 64
Clifford 95
Coca-Cola GmbH 97
Collins, General 133
Combined Steel Control Group 54
Commerz- und Privatbank 66
Cooper 153

Daladier 25
Darré, Walter 142
Degoutte, General 73
Dertinger, Georg 144
Deutsche Bank 66 71
Deutsche Continentale Gas-Gesellschaft 48
German "Edison Gesellschaft" 57
Deutsche Erdöl AG 72
Deutsche Solvay-Werke 48
Dietrich, Otto 142
Dillon Read & Cie. 30 45 58 59
Dinkelbach, Heinrich 63
Disconto-Bank 67
Dodge 45 74
Dönitz 142 145
Dorls 152
Draper, William H. 30 45 59 74
Dresdner Bank 66
Driault, Edouard 25
Dulles, Allan 146
Dulles, John Foster 146
Dunlop Rubber-Comp. 63
Du Pont 60
Duttweiler, Gottlieb 122

Eberhardt, Karl 142
Edding, Dr. F. 52
Egidi, v. 159
Eisenhower 62 91 92 93 95 97 106 116 117 118 119 121 130 134 135 138 139 140 141 143 144 162 188 189 190
Erdbeer, Willi 97

Finletter 138
Firestone Tire and Rubber Comp. 60
Flick-Konzern 48 62 72 142
Florian 68
Ford Motor Co. 60
Ford-Werke AG 60
Forrestal, James V. 59
Franke-Grieksch 152
Friedrich, Otto A. 60 78 79
Futch, General 125

Galland 150
Ganeval, J. 153
Gaulle, de 95
General Electric Comp. 43 57 60
General Motors 43 60
Gerhardt 155
Gesellschaft für Lindes Eismaschinen 69
Geyr v. Schweppenburg 120
Giller, General 152
Goebbels 40 113 114 129 130
Goethe, J. W. 45
Grasser, Anton 158
Groener 144
Gromyko 188
Grotewohl, Otto 20 138 170 187 188
Guderian, General 118, 145, 146 156
Gümbel, Colonel 101

Haas, de 107
Halder, General 118 145 146 156
Hallstein, Walter 154
Hamacher 97
Handy, Thomas 139 140 141
Haniel 49 71 72
Hanisch, Kurt 176
Hankey, Lord 141
Hansen, Admiral 101 148
Harriman, Averell 60 73 128
Hays, G. P. 152 155
Heinckel-Flugzeugwerke 69
Heinemann, Dr. 88 92 178
Hellwege 99
Henle, Dr. Günter 71
Henschel and Ash Locomotive Comp. Ltd. 69
Henschel u. Sohn 69
Hentschel, Karl 187
Heß 142
Hesse, Dr. Kurt 77 80 126
Heusinger, General 93 118 149 154
Heuß 94
Heye, Helmut 163
Himmler 67 152
Hindenburg, Paul v. 104 144
Hitler 13 17 24 25 26 29 35 40 47 49 62 68 71 72 77 95 99 101 104 113 114 116 118 140 142 144 145 146 150 161 181
Hoerath-Menge, E. 187
Hoesch 49 66 71 72
Hohberg, Hans 142
Hollidt, General 142
Hoover 34
Hornschu, Dr. F. E. 52
Houdremont, Eduard 142
Hübner, Herbert 142
Hugenberg 188
Hüttenwerk Hagen-Haspe 192
Hüttenwerk Rheinhausen AG 70

IG Farben 45 48 60 61 62 64 66 72 74 76 120 142
Ihm, Max 142
Ilgner, Max 64
Internationale Galalith-Gesellschaft 78
International Telephon and Telegraph Co. 60

Jackson, Robert H. 14 15
Janssen, Friedrich 142
Joel, Günter 142

Kaiser, Jakob 97 107 144
Kaufmann 152
Kehrel, Hans 142
Keppler, Wilhelm 142
Kerschan, Heinrich 142
Kiefer, Max 142
Kielmannsegg, Graf 147 149 152
Kiesinger, Kurt 99 100
Kilgore, Hartley M. 21 67
Kirkpatrik 141
Klepper, Otto 40
Klöckner, Florian 71
Klöckner-Werke 49 66 71 72 73
Koch, Dr. 129
Koeltz, General 32
Kost, Dr. Heinrich 50 63 71
Krakau, General 101
Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau 66
Krupp, Alfried 20 21 49 62 70 71 72 73
86 141 142 149
Kuntze, Walter 141

Lauer 101
Lautz, Ernst 142
Lehmann, Heinrich 142
Lehr, Dr. Robert 68 88 91 93 95 96 101
106 107 158 159 160 163 179
Lex, Hans v. 95
Leyser, Ernst v. 142
Linde, General 148
List, Wilhelm 141
Loerner, Hans 142
Lorenz, C. AG 60
Lovell 180
Luchs, Wilhelm 176
Lurgis AG 69
Lüth, Dr. Paul 96 97

McCarthy 146
McCloy, John 28 39 40 60 61 88 93 95
97 120 123 128 132 136 137 138 139
140 141 142 151 154 155 158 172 178
179 180 181 190 191
Mahlmann, General 119 120
Mallinckrodt 73
Mangold, Dr. v. 154
Mannesmann 49 71 72
Mannstein, General v. 141
Manteuffel, Freih. v. 95 103 152 156
Marshall 30 37
Martin, James 43
Matzky, Gerhard 161 162
Meer, Fritz ter 142
Meerkatz, Joachim v. 99
Mende, Erich 99 100
Menders, George 30
Mercantile Acceptance Corporation of
South Africa 69
Metzsch, v. 76 77
Mezière, Ulrich v. 154
Middleton, Drew 139 141 149
Molotov, V. M. 13 17 34 37
Montan-Union 49 51
Morgan, I. P. 57 60 73
Moyland, von Steengracht 142
Mücke, Helmuth v. 187
Muench, Aloysius J. 151
Müller 181
Müller, Erich 142
Müller, M. C. 78

Napoleon I 49
National Broadcasting Corporation
(NBC) 122
Natzmer, General 152
Naumann, Friedrich 49
Niemöller, Martin 119 179
Nitze, Henry Paul 59
Nixon, Russel A. 43 45 62 64 74
Nölting 66
North German Iron and Steel Control
62

Oberhof, Johannes 187
Oertzen, W. v. 150
O'Hanlon 180
Ollenhauer, Erich 92 130 132 141 144
Oppenheim, Sal. u. Cie. 67 73
Oster, Achim 147
Oster, General 147
Ostermann, Ernst 154

Pacceli, Nuntius 151
Paget, Reginald 141
Papen, Franz v. 188
Paul, Hugo 91 103
Peiper, Joachim 141
Perón, General 150
Peters 96
Pferdmenges 67 71 99 100
Phoenix AG 60 78
Pieck, Wilhelm 169 188 189
Poage, Robert 133
Pock, Hermann 142
Poppendick, Helmut 142
Puhl, Emil 142

Ramcke, General 102 103
Raeder, Admiral 141
Rasche, Karl 142
Reimann, Max 107 181 182 199 200
Reinhardt 96
Remer 101 152
Renner 91 92
Reuter, Ernst 130
Rheinische Stahlwerke 72
Rhodes, Cecil 72
Rische 91 92
Robertson, Brian 63
Roelen, Dr. Wilhelm 71
Rockefeller 73
Rödiger, Konrad 154
Roosevelt 16 44 67 112
Rosenberg 40
Rothenberger, Kurt 142
Rothschild 73
Rudel, Hans Ulrich 149 151
Ruge, Friedrich 163
Ruhrchemie AG 69
Rust, Arthur 181

Sbosnj 181
Scammon, Richard 35 36 38
Schilling, N. H. 78
Schlegelberger, Franz 142
Schlieben, General v. 162
Schmidt, Carlo 130 141
Schnitzler, Georg v. 62 142
Schröder 73
Schumacher, Kurt 38 39 88 92 93 94 112 113 129 130 135 136 138 141 144 170 177 178
Schuman, Robert 154
Schwalm, Fritz 142
Schwerin, Graf Gerhart 147 148 149 156 158
Schwerin-Krosigk, Graf v. 142
Seebohm 107
Seeckt, General v. 158
Sega 125
Severing, Karl 107 151
Siegmann, Fred 181
Siemens-Werke 72 73
Sogemeier, Dr. Martin 78
Speidel, Hans 141 149 154
Speidel, Wilhelm 141 142 149 158 178
Spiecker, Dr. 118 149 150 151
Stalin, J. V. 16 17 18 44 113 114 188 193
Standard Oil Comp. 43 59 60 66
Stauffenberg, Baron v. 100
Stein, v. 73
Stinnes 63 73
Stinnes, Hugo 63 72
Strasser, Otto 151 152
Student, General 102 113 158
Syngman Rhee 118

Taft, Robert 122
Thälmann, Ernst 91
Thomas (Senator) 22
Thyssen-Bosnemisza, Baron Heinrich 71
Thyssen, Fritz 21 49 63 70 71 86
Ticehurst 180
Tillich, Ernst 99 100
Trenchard, Lord 133
Truman, Harry 17 26 32 59 87 97 113 115 116 133 138 188
Tschentscher, Erwin 142

Ulbricht, Walter 91 187 189

Vanderbilt 72
Varst, Gustav v. 161
Vereinigte Stahlwerke AG 59 63 64 68 70
Velsen 73
Vögler 73
Vohwinkel 145
Volkswagenwerke Wolfsburg 69
Voorhis, Jerry 30

Waggonfabrik Uerdingen AG 185
Waldow 96
Waldthausen, Familie v. 72
Wander, Hilde 52
Wansbrough-Jones, Lloyd 154
Warburg, James P. 32
Ward, John A. 154
Wehner 103 107 114
Wehrhahn 68 72 73 76 82
Weizsäcker 142
Wessel, Frau 92
Wibsiek, Ernst 181
Wildermuth 149
Wilkenson, Lawrence 31
Wilson, Charles E. 60
Wintershall AG 72
Woehrmann, 142

Young, Owen D. 57

Zangen, Wilhelm 72
Zichy-Thyssen, Gräfin Anita 71
Zinsser, John Sharman 60